BX
801
.E17
vol.141

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

Vol. CXLI, No. 1 July, 1959

CONTENTS

Mother Most Chaste . . . . *John L. Murphy* 1

Sin and Sacrifice: Reflections on Leviticus
John J. Donohue, S.J. 6

The Pro Civitate Christiana Movement . . . *James F. Cassidy* 12

Cardinal Carlo Confalonieri . . . . *Igino Cecchetti* 16

Priestly Devotion at Mass . . . . . *Raphael Vanderhaar, O.F.M.* 19

Colonial Protestantism and the Rise of Democracy
Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S.J. 24

Saint Augustine: The Christian Preacher. Part II.
Thomas F. Stransky, C.S.P. 33

The Ecumenical Council and Christian Reunion
Joseph Clifford Fenton 45

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

The Confessor Suggesting Rhythm 58

A Chaplain's Power to Confirm 59

Rights and Duties of a Vasectomized Man 60

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

The Priest as a Hypnotist 60
Adoration at the Repository 61
Corpus Christi and the Addition of Alleluia 62
Position of the Monstrance 62
Sign of the Cross on the Gospel 62
Burse Against the Tabernacle 63
Book on Vestments 63
Privileged Requiem Masses 63

BOOK REVIEWS

A Poet Before the Cross, *by Paul Claudel* 64
Freud and Religion, *by Gregory Zilboorg* 65
The Church Incarnate: The Sacred Function of Christian Architecture, *by Rudolph Schwarz* 69

BOOKS RECEIVED 71

HOW SHOULD PRIESTS DIRECT PEOPLE REGARDING THE MOVIES?
with APPENDIX—1957

Legion of Decency

By
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

(Reprinted by Popular Demand)

This article originally appeared in the April 1946 edition of The American Ecclesiastical Review. An Appendix has been added, and the 16-page reprint is now available in an attractively bound, paper cover.

Single copy . . . . 30¢
In lots of 10 . . . . 25¢ ea.
In lots of 25 . . . . 22¢ ea.
In lots of 50 . . . . 20¢ ea.

Prices Postpaid

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America   Washington 17, D.C.

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

MOTHER MOST CHASTE

It is a basic fact, although sometimes overlooked, that the Christian faith involves a number of apparent contradictions on all sides. The human mind, for example, has no difficulty in understanding the notion of "one" and "three," nor the concept of "nature" and "person." When we speak of the Trinity, however, and affirm that there are three Persons in one divine nature, the mind struggles with the problem of how all of these notions may be joined together properly. It is, of course, nothing more than an *apparent* contradiction; there is no real conflict in the notion of the Trinity. Nevertheless, the depth of this mystery and the weakness of the human mind make it impossible to grasp this truth fully. It is only with God's help—with His grace—that the mind can accept this truth.

The same thing is true of Mary. There is a mystery of faith involved in our acceptance of Mary's role in the plan of salvation. We affirm, for example, that Mary is truly a virgin and truly a mother. From a purely human viewpoint, this might seem to be a contradiction. Sexual intercourse is the pre-requisite of motherhood, so that to be a mother means to give up one's virginity. This is as God wills it.

Yet in regard to Mary, we see once again the power of God active in her life. Mary became the Mother of Christ without losing her virginity by an act of intercourse; nor was her virginity destroyed when she gave birth to her child. This is the mystery of the virgin birth. It is for this reason that we not only "know" about Mary, but we also "believe" in her: we accept the fact that she is simultaneously a virgin and a mother.

In the history of the Church, there have been many Christians who have attempted to over-emphasize one or the other of these truths. Actually, this is the source of all heresy; it is marked by an over-simplification, a refusal to accept the complete truth. There have been those who, in this instance, would claim that Mary did not remain a virgin at all. Thus for them there is no difficulty in understanding that she is a true mother. On the other hand, some have tended to stress her virginity so highly that they overlooked the fact that she is also a true mother.

This second error has very often been associated with those heretics who looked upon "matter" as evil in itself. At the very beginning of the Christian era, there were those who embraced the teaching of the Gnostics, and who held that the world came from two different sources. The world of the spirit came from God, but the physical or material world was the creation of an evil power. As a result, since material things came from an evil source, they are evil in themselves.

When this teaching was applied to Christ, the Christian Gnostics concluded that He could not have had a true physical body. For them, the divine Word simply could not have assumed anything that would be evil in itself. They concluded, therefore, that Christ only "appeared" to have a human body; thus the name given to them—the Docetists (from the Greek word *"dokein,"* to appear).

According to this approach, Mary was not the true Mother of Christ. A mother gives to her child the body it possesses, but if Christ had no actual human body, Mary was not truly His Mother.

This same error continued to evidence itself in later centuries under various forms. At the basis, in each instance, was the general notion that material and physical things are evil in themselves; they must accordingly be rejected. It was only to be expected that this error would sooner or later appear in regard to sexual matters. The sexual life of mankind is something so intimately bound up with man's physical body that those who would hold to this error would also have to conclude that sex is evil in itself, and not simply that sex (like other elements of human life) can be misused.

At the basis of much of the prudery associated with sex we can note the overtones of this Gnostic heresy. In the back of many minds there still lurks the suspicion that having babies is a degrading thing, and that motherhood (and fatherhood) is a concession made for those who lack the courage to tread the lofty path of virginity.

All of this involves a great deal of confusion. To lose virginity through the proper exercise of lawful marriage is certainly no disgrace. Quite the contrary, it is a sacred, a sacramental thing. It is so holy that it is intimately related to the object of a special sacrament, instituted by Christ Himself; the primary purpose of marriage is the procreation of children.

Virginity and chastity, therefore, are not the same things. Virginity refers to the exclusion of all carnal pleasure throughout all of one's life. It is a total exclusion of the legitimate pleasures of matrimony, and it is a virtue insofar as it proceeds from the desire to dedicate one's mind and body to God in a very special manner. The state of virginity is a higher state because of the higher motives, but this does not mean that the loss of virginity in matrimony is "evil" or "sinful." It is a question of seeking that which is better, a matter of the various degrees of good.

Chastity, on the other hand, is concerned with living a sexual life in accordance with one's state in life. One who has lost virginity through marriage still leads a chaste life, provided he or she excludes all carnal pleasure not permitted by the married state. So also an unmarried person must lead a life of chastity by excluding all carnal pleasure from his life; even one who has sinned in the past, and thus lost virginity, can still lead a life of chastity in the future.

Those unmarried people who take a vow of chastity simply add a *second* reason for living a life of chastity. For motives of perfection, they have vowed to do that which the law of God already obliges them to do. This does involve not entering the state of matrimony, although in the case of a temporary vow this obligation would continue only until the time for the vow was completed.

With these distinctions in mind, we can see the meaning of the Church's invocation of Mary: "Mother most chaste, pray for us." What the Church would emphasize is not only the chastity of Mary, but also the fact that Mary *is* a true mother. The fact that she retained her virginity does not take away in any degree from her true motherhood. Scripture tells us that Christ was like to us in all things except sin. To paraphrase this, we might say that Mary was like to all mothers except for the loss of virginity. Mary combined in her life two extremes; this no other woman may do. She knew no sexual pleasure, and yet she conceived a child within her womb; she carried this child for nine months and then brought Him forth without losing her physical integrity. This mystery of the virgin birth is as proper to Mary alone as is the Incarnation to Christ, her Son.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that Mary is a chaste mother precisely because she brought forth her child without losing her virginity, as though all other mothers were necessarily unchaste. Mary lived out her life—an entirely unique situation—according to the design of God. That plan is repeated in no other instance. Therefore, since Mary is both virgin and mother, she is chaste both as virgin and mother; she has a dual title in this regard.

Mary was entirely faithful to her lawful husband, Joseph. Hers, then, was the chastity not only of the unmarried but of the married. She was a true wife, although with the consent of her husband, a virgin wife, and by the power of God, a virgin mother. But Mary was a true wife, and she and Joseph both agreed not to exercise the matrimonial rights which were lawfully theirs.

As a result, when the Church honors Mary as the Mother most chaste, it is as a reminder that chastity is the adornment also of the married. It is the virtue of the devoted Christian mother and father. While no other woman can imitate Mary in the mystery of the virgin birth, every mother can imitate her in the chastity of her married life (even though, in these instances, it will not be a virginal life). So also, every father can live by that same spirit, the spirit which also marked the life of Mary's husband, her "most chaste spouse."

In the ordinary plan of God, the sacred act of intercourse within the sacramental bonds of matrimony is not only an expression of love, nor simply a surrender of one spouse to the other. Over and above that, it is a surrender to the Will of God. Without this surrender, the human race could not continue. What turns sex into sin is simply taking such acts out of their proper context, interfering in this way with the purpose of nature and the eternal plan of God.

Mary stands then not only as the symbol of virginity, but also as the ideal of Christian motherhood and its correlative term of Christian fatherhood. To praise the Virgin Mother is not to derogate in any way the honor of non-virginal motherhood associated with the sacrament of marriage. Just the opposite, it is to praise the glory of true Christian parenthood, to hold up for imitation the spirit that marked the life of Mary precisely as Mother.

Those who fail to see sex and marriage as a part of God's eternal plan, of course, and who look upon sexual matters as something essentially evil, will never appreciate the role of Mary in the work of salvation. Although virginal in nature, the motherhood of Mary is no less real. It was from her flesh that the flesh of Christ took its rise, from her womb that the Saviour of mankind came forth.

In like manner, it is from the bodies of Christian parents that the members of Christ's Mystical Body will receive their flesh, from the union of husband and wife. These Christian parents are, therefore, associated with Christ in building up His Church upon earth. To them is given, as was to Mary, the task of forming Christ; they are to fashion not only the bodies of Christ's members on earth, but their spiritual life as well. This is the special cooperation of fathers and mothers emphasized by Pius XII in his encyclical on the Church, "a cooperation which they must offer to our divine Saviour as though they were His associates."

In all of this, Mary remains the ideal of the Christian parent. The chastity that marked her motherhood must reappear in their lives. Thus will they contribute to the great work of Christ upon earth, to that "building up the body of Christ"; it is a work sealed throughout by the supernatural. Into the fabric of human love there must, therefore, be woven the grace of Christ, with whom and through whom this earthly Church achieves the "building up of itself in love."

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

SIN AND SACRIFICE: REFLECTIONS ON LEVITICUS

At the center of Christian worship is the up-raised chalice and the fractured host: the Blood of the New Covenant and the Body broken for the remission of sins. Here also salvation-history finds its center. Here the burnt offerings and the blood libations of the Israelites are focused and sublimated in the redemptive sacrifice of the Son of God. The crucified Christ—with pierced side—rent the veil of the Temple and entered the Holy of Holies with the Blood of Salvation. And St. Paul would not tire of preaching the new sacrifice: Christ crucified; for redemption was in "Christ Jesus whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood." The blood of goats and heifers purified the flesh; the blood of Christ purifies the conscience.[1]

Calvary, as the fulfillment of the "sweet smelling" sacrifices of the Old Covenant, had special meaning for the Israelite. During forty years of desert wandering, during the prosperity of the kings and the humiliation of the exile the Israelite was "taught of God."[2] In suffering and death he turned his face toward Yahweh and asked for protection. In sin he sought pardon through sacrifice. Above all, he looked forward to the "day of Yahweh."[3] Through progressive revelation he was prepared by God to accept the mystery of an Incarnate God crucified.

Hebrew history is not a static record of judges, kings and prophets; it is a dynamic element in the encounter of man with God. For St. Paul, Calvary fulfilled the bloody sacrifices of his people. Not only were these sacrifices a type and their elements a symbol. The theology which rooted them in revelation was itself a preparation for the theology of Redemption. It is the same God who "spoke in times past by the prophets" and who "last of all in these days has spoken to us by his Son."[4]

At the center of Hebrew sacrificial theology stands a transcendent God, not moved by sacrifice to love men, but moved by his own love for man to ordain sacrifice. Sacrifice cleanses man and reunites him to God. Sacrifice has no power over God, for all its power flows from him. Certainly this is an essential line in the Christian blueprint. If it fades, true perspective is lost. A look at Old Testament sacrifice should help to define this line.

---

[1] *Heb.* 9:13 f.

[2] *John* 6:45.

[3] *Amos* 5:18.

[4] *Heb.* 1:1-2.

Two sacrifices among the Hebrews are classed as expiatory sacrifices.[5] They are expiatory in the sense that they remove sin and thus placate the anger of God. In chapter four of Leviticus the "sacrifice for sin" is delineated; in chapters five and six, the "sacrifice for guilt."

Scholars agree that this section of the Pentateuch was composed at a late date, in the exilic or post-exilic period. Nevertheless, the concept of sacrifice found here is not peculiar to late Hebrew history; it extends back to the time of Moses. The external rites of a religion are tenacious and retrospective. People tend to hold on to the practices of their fathers even though the same practices may in time acquire a new interpretation. The history of Israel indicates minor changes and even abuses in sacrificial cult. Still, the systematized rubrics described in Leviticus lead to conclusions valid for the whole sweep of Hebrew history. It was a history fashioned by the hand of Yahweh.

This stubbornness with which the Hebrews clung to the external practices of their forebears helps explain the external similarities with the rituals of Babylonia, Assyria, Canaan, Hatti and Egypt. It does not explain the meaning of the rites. This is the task of theology, the theology not drawn from pagan rituals but revealed by God through the prophets. The rite of the scapegoat in Leviticus may have its root in the scapegoat of the Hittite ritual, but Levitic insistence on penitence for sin adds an interpretive element which had no precedent among the neighbors of Israel.

Of these neighbors, some were obsessed with getting rid of physical evil, others besought the gods for a regular return of the seasons, and still others were preoccupied with preventing any possible evil which might befall the dead. They had sacrifices bloody and unbloody, they had gift offerings and libations. But their rituals paid service to gods who were glorified humans. The anger of a god could be appeased by a well prepared meal. And these people conceived sin as material and external only. Its expiation was a matter of the right formula. This was not the Old Testament ideal, no matter how often the Israelites fell short of it.

---

[5] This treatment of Leviticus and the sacrifices of extra-biblical peoples is derived from Luigi Moraldi, *Espiazione e riti espiatori* (Roma: Pont. Inst. Biblico, 1956).

In Leviticus the two sacrifices for sin are described. The first is for sins of ritual impurity. It requires a "sin offering" which varies with the theocratic position of the sinner: a priest or the whole community must offer a young bull, a ruler offers a male goat, one of the people offers a female goat or lamb. The sinner imposes his hand on the victim and kills it. Then the priest takes the blood of the victim, sprinkles the veil, anoints the horns of the altar and pours out the remainder at the foot of the altar of holocaust. The fat of the animal is burned upon the altar and the flesh is burned outside the camp. Thus the priest makes atonement for the sin and the sinner is forgiven.

The other sacrifice is for a sin of "trespass," that is, a violation of the rights of God or the material rights of a neighbor. It requires a "guilt offering," which in all cases is a ram, no matter what the dignity of the offender. In addition this sin requires a restoration of the damage caused with an added penalty of one-fifth of the value. The killing of the ram is followed by a more simple blood rite, but the fat and flesh of the animal are burned as in the "sin sacrifice." Atonement is made and the sin is forgiven.

From these two sacrifices emerge three common elements: sin, blood rite and atonement.

Both sacrifices are for sin, but the Hebrew concept of sin in this context is not ours. The word sin is qualified in all but two cases by "unwittingly." The sins of Leviticus are predominantly material, objective sins: sins of ritual impurity or sins of trespass contracted without subjective guilt or with only slight subjective guilt. At first this fact seems to push the Hebrews back into the pagan magic of their neighbors, but later we shall see that this notion has special force in the divine pedagogy.

The result of the sacrifice in each case is that "the priest (makes) atonement for him before the Lord and he (is) forgiven."[6] This atonement or expiation expressed by the Hebrew word *kipper* is not an action exercised on God. Rather it is directed to the person or to the object which has become impure and is thus cut off from union with God. What the sacrifice accomplishes is the removal of the impurity and the restoration of union with God.

---

[6] *Lev.* 4:26.

The blood rite performed by the priest in each of the sacrifices is based on the close connection between the moral conduct of the Israelites and their land and Temple. They were a "holy people" who were led into the "holy land" of promise, and their Temple was the "holy place" of encounter between man and God. Ritual impurities contracted by the people also tainted their land and the Temple. Sin was death, blood was life. The priest, sprinkling the blood of calves or goats, revivified the land and the Temple and restored to God a holy land, a holy people and his holy place.

In the ritual of the sin offering there is an added element: the offerer placed his hand on the head of the victim before killing it. In this way the sinner signified his solidarity with the victim. It was his victim offered according to God's prescription to efface the impurity he had unwittingly contracted.

There are other sacrifices in the Hebrew ritual—burnt offerings, peace offerings, and cereal offerings—but the "sin offering" and the "guilt offering" are the only sacrifices which expiate sin. They are not magical rites which do away with all and every type of sin. They have definite limits drawn by revelation. They remove only material sins of ritual impurity and material or slightly subjective sins of trespass against God or one of his people.

This notion of material sin and its removal by sacrifice seems to be a carry-over from Hebrew surroundings. The Assyrians and Babylonians had this same notion or physico-material sin. But while this links the Hebrews with their neighbors it also separates them. In the Temple these sins and sacrifices were injected with new meaning.

Hebrew morality, of course, was in no way limited to this concept of material sin. The Book of Numbers records the effect of grievous, subjective sin: "The person who does anything with a high hand . . . shall be cut off from among his people."[7]

But why make sacrifice obligatory for material sin? Does this element find a parallel in the New Testament sacrifice? It seems so. In this notion of material sin and its effects there is a foreshadowing of Original Sin.[8] There are other explanations, but this strikes closest to Christian dogma. The Hebrew was taught that he could contract guilt without personal culpability. Of course, these scholastic terms were not his. He would have said: a man can be separated from Yahweh by unwitting contact with his surroundings. In this case, sacrifice awakened in the Israelite the proper dispositions of humility and acceptance, and restored him to union with Yahweh. Calvary would penetrate behind this symbolic surface and delete Original Sin—the unwitting sin of nature that stained the soul of every man.

---

[7] *Num.* 15:22-31.

[8] A. M. Dubarle, O.P., indicates this orientation in his article "Condition humaine dans l'Ancien Testament," *Revue Biblique,* LXIII (1956), 345.

There is significance also in the limitation imposed on these sacrifices. It clearly indicates that the sacrifices have no inherent value which can placate God. Sacrifice was not man's gift to God so much as it was God's gift to man. This is clear from *Leviticus* 17:11. "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and *I have given it for you* upon the altar to make atonement. . . ." Sacrifice, then, had only the power which God gave it.

Sacrifice was expiatory and placated God in a very special sense: it removed from man what prohibited his union with God. It did not affect God. God hates sin only because he acts out of Love. Sin becomes an obstacle to his working in the souls of men. Sacrifice appeased God's anger only because it removed sin.

Calvary does not give anything to God. The Pauline terms, "salvation," "redemption," "expiation," used to describe Christ's sacrifice have often been interpreted in a juridical sense which would lead one to think that God received back some loss of prestige or honor. But Pauline terminology takes its meaning from the categories of Hebrew theology. They are not patient of strict juridicism.[9]

These categories—the utter transcendence of God who does not need creatures, his divine liberality which can only give and never receive, his infinite wisdom which demands that man remove the obstacle of sin by cooperating with divine prescriptions—these are the vital backdrop for sacrifice in the Old as well as in the New Testament.

The New Testament Sacrifice fulfills the Old; it also transcends it. The sacrifice of Christ does have a value in itself; in itself it is agreeable to God, for God loves his Incarnate Son. And there is another point of difference: the world of the New Testament is a sacramental world—sensible and spiritual. The sensible not only represents and signifies supernatural grace but contains and communicates it.[10] Sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb we share divine life in a way that Leviticus could never foresee.

---

[9] Stanislaus Lyonnet, S.J., "Conception Paulinienne de la rédemption," *Lumière et Vie,* VII (March, 1958), 35-66.

JOHN J. DONOHUE, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

---

[10] J. Lecuyer, C.S.Sp., "Réflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas," *Revue Thomiste,* LV (1955), 351 ff.

THE PRO CIVITATE CHRISTIANA MOVEMENT

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have seen Secularism and Communism wage bitter war against the long acknowledged evidence of history that modern civilization owes its most precious constituents to Christianity. Indeed, such is the antagonism which the advocates of these nefarious theories have held for the message of Christ that they have constantly sought to prove that Christianity, instead of being at the root of what is best in our civilized life, has only exercised a baneful influence on civilization and should be supplanted by principles of living based on sheer materialism. To undo as far as possible the widespread evil thus effected by these anti-Christian forces and repair this grave injustice of the intelligentsia of the West there now exists in Assisi a very impressive movement of enlightened Catholic "Volunteers" bound by solemn pledge.

This movement, known as *Pro Civitate Christiana,* owes its origin to Father Giovanni Rossi. This priest, in December, 1939, brought together a group of young men and women whom he persuaded to forsake their various livelihoods for complete dedication to the work of spiritualizing the cultural, social and economic features of contemporary life. For this scheme to restore the Christian concept of society Father Rossi soon received very heartening support in its approval, not only by the Bishop of Assisi, but also by the Holy See.

The members of this organization must renounce not only professional but also family ties. They are expected to live in community life although they are bound by no religious vows. For this work, too, they must be intellectually well equipped for they must have university degrees. Furthermore, this academic equipment they must enhance by three years' specialized training for their apostolate in the form of theological and other studies. At the close of this period they solemnly pledge themselves to devote their lives to the promotion of the ideals of their Association.

The headquarters building of this movement known as The Citadel aptly commands a fine view of the Valley of Spoleto whence St. Francis set out seven centuries ago to restore Christian civilization. Thither, lured by the fame of its activities, come every year thousands of visitors, both Catholics and non-Catholics, from many parts of the world to discuss important themes.

The Christian Observatory is a very important part of the Citadel. Its function is to make Christ known to the world as its various forms of scholarly activity discover Him in the testimony given to Him by noted people throughout the centuries. For the spheres of operation of these different scholarly efforts the Observatory provides several complementary sections. Its Iconographic Documentation holds approximately 30,000 photographs of representations of Christ produced by artists from the earliest times until the present day. In its Christian Art Gallery are to be found contemporary artistic productions of Christ as the Divine Worker. In the Bibliography department one can find vast documentary material about Christ dating from the earliest manuscripts to current books and articles. To render access to this material easier for research workers a Christological library of about 14,000 books provides a synthesis of its contents arranged in a card index system of subjects, authors and titles. Its Quadrante Christiano section holds a wealth of material dealing with Christ in contemporary life collected from 300 foreign and Italian correspondents throughout the world. And finally there is a gramaphone department with about 2500 records of music with a Christian inspiration. This is the section of the Observatory most frequented by visitors. They find a great attraction in listening to the efforts of master musicians of many nations to interpret Christ.

The findings of scholarship in the Christian Observatory are conveyed to students through courses held annually from August to September. These have so appealed to those who appreciate the highways of intellectual endeavor that thousands, including Princes of the Church and Bishops, come to attend them. Each of these annual conventions sees one article of the Nicene Creed selected for expository treatment by biblical, dogmatic and juridical scholars of note. Then people of prominence in the social, political, scientific, legal, artistic and journalistic life are invited to discuss how the article in question can be implemented in their different spheres of interest.

Other vital discussions the Citadel has from Christmas to New Year's Day when university students from all parts of Italy convene there to speak on such themes as Christ and Marx, Existentialism and the Integral Man in Christianity. To complete the enlightenment derived from these discussions of the Assembly of Young People lectures are delivered by professors in their specialized subjects.

Even the summer holiday season is not allowed to pass by the Citadel without making its contribution to Christian enlightenment. During this period visitors to the Citadel are taken on tours to noted places in the surrounding country such as spots hallowed by association with the Seraph of Assisi and his followers. Some of the most eminent of these scholarly visitors are invited to discuss the teachings of Christ in the light of modern cultural and scientific thought. Thus do what are known as Conversations of Assisi lead noted men of letters, scientists, dramatists, critics and other types of intellectuals to splendid united effort in the interests of a revival of Christian culture.

But the work of this apostolate extends to far more than the intelligentsia. It embraces a Christian Bank Holiday movement which brings enlightenment to the workers both of the factory and of the farm. This encourages these classes to come to the Citadel, make themselves at home there and listen to lectures and discussions on Christian culture in a language well within the grasp of moderate intelligence and education.

Of this apostolate for the common man, however, the most far-reaching, practical and important feature is the Missions. These vividly recall the directness with which St. Francis and his followers sought on city streets and rural districts, on highways and byways, to bring Christ and His message to the ordinary man. Inspired by this Franciscan tradition the Volunteers of The Citadel organize missions wherever the Bishops ask them to do so. In the place selected they set up platforms and pulpits and there speak to the people in simple language of the truths of the Faith which the complexities and false ideologies of modern life have done so much to obscure or eliminate amongst the masses.

These Missions, which last for twelve days, are for the most part doctrinal. Of these days the most spectacular and impressive is the one on which enlargements of masterpieces of Christ are shown from a screen on a platform. These screen displays are accompanied by lectures. Each Mission concludes with a Mass of Charity and the dedication of the city or town to Christ. Hundreds of these Missions the Volunteers during the few years of their existence have given all over Italy. Everywhere their apostolate has attracted great crowds and has done much to make the people, instead of being diffident or negligent in matters of Faith, proud of its message and its noble influence on civilization. Even a goodly number who have been hostile to religion have found through this apostolate grace to return to a Christian way of life.

This movement for a Christian civilization, not content with its varied vocal activities, publishes an organ called *La Rocca.* This finely produced periodical, which appears every two weeks, contains articles on most topics of major interest for contemporary man. It has a wide circulation amongst readers ranging in varied interests from the man of high cultural attainments to the ordinary worker.

Thus does this fine movement go out into the world to bring it a message of sacrifice and spiritual certitude instead of the disillusionment so often arising from the rosy promises of secularism. Thus does it strive to convince the world of the need of that integration of Faith and life which points to Life Eternal.

JAMES F. CASSIDY

Waterford, Ireland

CARDINAL CARLO CONFALONIERI

The career of His Eminence Cardinal Carlo Confalonieri has been extraordinarily interesting. His name will always be associated with that of his august friend, His Holiness Pope Pius XI, whom he served in the capacity of private secretary throughout the entire course of that Pontiff's reign. Later, from January, 1950 until December, 1958, he worked as the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities in Rome. In both of these positions he co-operated in measures of outstanding importance for the Church of God throughout the world.

Like his great friend and patron, Cardinal Confalonieri was born in the province of Lombardy. Pope Pius XI's native town is Desio. Cardinal Confalonieri's birthplace is Seveso. Both towns are located in the upper part of the valley of the Brianza River.

Seveso, where the Cardinal was born on July 25, 1893, is intimately connected with the story of St. Peter Martyr, who was killed by heretics in the nearby forest of Farga on April 6, 1252. Young Carlo Confalonieri began his ecclesiastical studies in the minor seminary of St. Peter Martyr in his home town. He continued them at the Seminary of Monza and at the Liceo Parini in Milan. He took the first year of his theological course at the old Seminario Lombardo, and thus attended classes at the Gregorian University. As a result of the action by St. Pius X, who united various Italian seminaries then existing in Rome, the Cardinal spent his second year in sacred theology as a student of the then new Pontifical Roman Major Seminary at the Lateran.

After finishing his second year of theology, he was inducted into the Italian Army in 1914. Before leaving for his military service at the start of the first world war, the Cardinal and all of his fellow seminarians who had been called to the colors made their now famous promise to Our Lady. They pledged, before the picture of the *Madonna della Fiducia,* that, if they were privileged to live through the war, they would return to the seminary and would, throughout the remainder of their lives, strive to foster devotion to the Blessed Mother under her title as Our Lady of Confidence. It is a matter of record that Our Lady heard their petition, and that their promise has been kept.

While he was still in the Italian Army, the young Confalonieri was ordained subdeacon and deacon in January, 1916. Two months later he received priestly ordination in the Sanctuary of St. Peter Martyr in Seveso. Two days after his priestly ordination he was back in his barracks.

After the war he served for two years as curate in the little town of Barlassina. From that post he was sent to Rome to act as private secretary to Cardinal Achille Ratti, who had just been named Archbishop of Milan. Many weeks were to elapse before the new Archbishop took possession of his See. During that time Father Confalonieri acted as his secretary, in Rome and in the other cities Cardinal Ratti visited before proceeding to Milan.

Father Confalonieri began his work for Cardinal Ratti in 1921. The following year his illustrious patron was elected to the Sovereign Pontificate, and took the name Pius XI. The newly elected Pope called Father (now Archbishop) Diego Venini from Milan to share the secretarial duties with Father Confalonieri. Together these two devoted priests worked to aid the Holy Father during all the years of his reign. Cardinal Confalonieri has told the story of those years in his book *Pio XI Visto da Vicino.*

In 1939 Pope Pius XI died, and was succeeded on the throne of Peter by Pope Pius XII. For two years Monsignor Confalonieri served the new Sovereign Pontiff, and then, in March, 1941, was named Archbishop of Aquila. He received his archiepiscopal consecration and the pallium from the hands of Pope Pius XII himself.

Archbishop Confalonieri served as Archbishop of this city of the Marches during some of the most troubled and sorrowful days in the history of Italy. The military authorities which were in charge in that district have since attested to the fact that the civilian population was spared a great deal of suffering and violence by reason of the ceaseless vigilance and pastoral care of their Ordinary.

On Jan. 25, in the Holy Year of 1950, Pope Pius XII named Archbishop Confalonieri to the post of Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities. This Congregation had always been especially dear to him. During the last two years of his life, Pope Pius XI had taken to himself the Prefectship of this highly important branch of the Roman Curia. Naturally this had made his faithful private secretary especially interested in the workings of this Congregation.

For almost nine complete years Archbishop Confalonieri supervised the activities of the Congregation, under the leadership of the illustrious Cardinal Joseph Pizzardo, the Prefect. During this administration the Congregation was the scene of unprecedented activity.

It is interesting to note that the first American priests were appointed as Counsellors and as Consultors to the Congregation during the secretaryship of Archbishop Confalonieri. The first such appointments were made before the new Secretary had completed his first year in his office.

One of the mort important developments during his term of office was the revival of the Pontifical Roman Theological Academy by Pope Pius XII. Archbishop Confalonieri was made one of the original members *honoris causa* of this newly reconstituted organization.

Archbishop Confalonieri remained as Secretary to the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities throughout the rest of Pope Pius XII's reign. He was one of the first group of prelates raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate after the accession of Pope John XXIII to the Sovereign Pontificate. Now he is a member of that same Congregation which he once served in the capacity of Secretary.

IGINO CECCHETTI

Vatican City

PRIESTLY DEVOTION AT MASS

"It is the Mass that matters." To this familiar saying we might add: for the priest, it is the *manner* of celebrating the Mass that matters.

The truth of this statement follows from the dignity and sublimity of the Holy Sacrifice. This "clean oblation" was foretold by the prophets, prefigured by the ceremonies of the Old Law, instituted in that momentous night of the Last Supper, and is now offered from the rising of the sun until its going down every day of every year from generation to generation. By it the name of God is glorified exceedingly among the nations.

The matchless dignity of the Mass makes it the greatest act which can be performed by man. According to Pope St. Gregory, the altar of sacrifice is the meeting place of heaven and earth. "For who can doubt," he writes, "but that, at the sound of the priest's voice at the hour of sacrifice, the heavens are opened, the choirs of angels stand in reverent awe before the mystery of Jesus Christ, the heights bend down to the depths, earth meets heaven, and worlds of the seen and the unseen blend into one."

When the priest offers this sacrifice, he reaches the apex of his sacred functions. Since the Mass is the most inspiring action on this side of heaven, it is all important that it be offered with the utmost care.

In celebrating Holy Mass, every priest should try to be a *perfectionist.* Can we imagine anyone at any time who should be more attentive, concerned, and reverent than he who is another Christ, when offering the spotless oblation of the Body and Blood of the Son of God to His heavenly Father?

Even pagans considered it obligatory to exercise special care in sacred functions. Plutarch, writing about the illustrious general Aemilius Paulus, informs us that, after he had distinguished himself by his military leadership, he was elected to the office of augur for the city of Rome. The historian adds that Aemilius Paulus was exceptionally conscientious in performing the rites of the priesthood. To those who found fault with his exactness and extreme care in the discharge of these duties, he replied that it was his obligation to be precise as a mark of his reverence for the gods and of his concern for the welfare of his country.

Addressing the priest offering Mass, Thomas a Kempis says, "thou oughtest approach this holy work with fear and reverence."

Everything which stands in the way of celebrating in a commendable manner; every bad habit in our exterior deportment which is inconsistent with the proper attitude at the altar, as well as sinful affections, must be uprooted and discarded, no matter what it may cost, no matter how great the difficulty.

It is inconceivable that anyone who really believes in the Mass and loves it will rush through the ceremonies or perform the sacred functions in a perfunctory way.

According to St. Francis de Sales, haste is the ruin of devotion; this is true above all in the celebration of Mass. Inevitably it leads to superficiality, slovenliness, and a want of reverence for the sacred liturgy. The prayers of Mass are so many, varied and profound, that keen concentration is required to do justice to them, and this is clearly impossible if one skips over them in a hurry. The more our attention is drawn to the letter and spirit of the rites and ceremonies, the more will we experience the effect of their richness and fullness in our personal life.

Our good Catholics, including those who are busy, don't want to see the priest race through the Mass. They are disappointed when he does, and sometimes they are scandalized. Some even wonder whether they have fulfilled their Sunday obligation after assisting at such a function, and, if they requested the Mass to be said for their intention, they feel they have been cheated.

We have the liturgical movement to interest the people in the Mass; we have sermons, conferences and study clubs directed to the same end; but all this will fail, and fail completely, unless there is precisely one indispensable requirement: *debita attentio et devotio ex parte celebrantis.* Too often that is lacking.

Anyone who esteems the Blessed Sacrament highly is greatly disappointed if he must witness the hasty, superficial, irreverent celebration of Mass. He deplores this more than an offensive sermon or any other unbecoming conduct in church.

It happens occasionally on Sunday that the celebrant ascends the pulpit and speaks about the Mass; he describes it as "something out of this world," and then returns to the altar, and by his actions indicates that to him it is not quite as important as his breakfast.

The impression made upon non-Catholics by a hurried performance of the ceremonies is equally unfortunate. They speak about the perfunctory way in which Mass is offered at times. One unbeliever, after witnessing such an exhibition, remarked to the priest: "Father, you and I have one thing in common concerning the Mass; we just don't believe in it." Another, who had observed how rapidly Holy Communion was distributed, expressed the opinion that apparently even priests do not believe in the Real Presence, because no one with faith would treat the Body of Christ in such an unceremonious manner. He thought one should be more reverent if he were distributing mere bread in church.

In the *Life of St. Alphonse Ligouri,* we read about the grief he felt at observing the hasty and unedifying manner in which Mass was offered in many places. It led him to publish several tracts in which he roundly denounced the abuse. The reverent and irreverent celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was always the topic of one of the conferences in the many retreats he gave to priests. One day he went so far as to affirm that the more grave violations did not deserve pardon and that they might be a sign of final reprobation. He based his statement upon an opinion of St. John Chrysostom. One of the retreatants, who had a bad reputation, protested and openly voiced his objection to the words of the saint. The next morning, as this priest began Mass, he collapsed and died without regaining consciousness.

St. Augustine, in his *Sermo de dominica et aliis festis celebrandis,* has a scathing denunciation of those who shorten the Mass in order to please influential people. Tertullian attacked the abuse with his laconic "Sacrificat an insultat?" Is this priest offering sacrifice to God or trying to insult Him?

There seems to be an opinion that there is some accomplishment in racing through sacred functions. Why this should be is not clear. A photographer is not likely to pride himself in the speed with which he snaps his pictures, nor is a devotee of golf known to boast about the rapidity with which he covers the course; and if a conductor of a symphony hurries the orchestra unduly, he is sure to receive most unfavorable comments from the critics in the next day's newspapers.

Surely the best way to say Mass is to celebrate as we believe our divine Saviour did at the Last Supper. We cannot picture Him rushing through words and actions on the memorable night of the institution of the Holy Eucharist.

If we could offer the Holy Sacrifice only once a year, we would take all the time required to make it a perfect oblation. But *quotidiana vilescunt*. This is never more true than when applied to the celebration of Mass.

Naturally, there are degrees of reverence and irreverence in the manner of saying Mass. Moreover, not all failings are to be attributed to indifference and not all are due to haste; yet, a practical realization of the sublimity of the Eucharistic Sacrifice must result in a dignified and devotional attitude at the altar. Schedules, also on Sunday, must never be so tight that the proper offering of Mass becomes impossible.

Would to God that all of us appreciated the Mass as Cardinal Newman when he said: "To me nothing is so consoling, so piercing, so thrilling as the Mass . . . It is a great action, the greatest action that can be on earth."—or as another convert, John L. Stoddard, who wrote: "To those who comprehend it [the Mass], it is the very soul of Catholicism, and the essence of Christianity . . . The steps by which my faltering feet ascended to its altar were its ancient prayers. These, as I read them and appreciated their significance, in connection with the ceremony itself, filled me with awe and admiration."

No one should value the Mass more than he who has the privilege of offering it. Perhaps all of us could make further efforts to perfect ourselves in this most important act of the day, while some need to change their method radically.

It will be well to apply to ourselves the words of Cardinal Mercier writing to his seminarians at the end of his life: "Always offer the Holy Sacrifice as if you were yourselves present on Calvary. Do this with the most fervent faith and devotion of which you are capable. Remember that you became priests in order to celebrate Mass."

Another useful admonition comes to us from a Catholic college student. Replying to the question, what, in his estimation, would be most conducive to the religious life of the college, he said: "Have the priests say Mass as our Lord would." No doubt this would contribute much to the spiritual welfare of our people.

RAPHAEL VANDERHAAR, O.F.M.

St. Boniface Friary
San Francisco, Cal.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July 1909, entitled "The Pontifical Diplomatic Service" and written by Fr. Joseph Murphy, describes the history and the functions of the office of Papal Secretary of State and of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. . . . The Most Rev. M. F. Howley, Archbishop of St. John's, Newfoundland, contributes an article on "The Site of the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes." He describes very exactly the terrain around the Sea of Galilee where our Lord performed this great miracle and explains the significance of the events that preceded and followed this wonderful manifestation of divine power and mercy. . . . A short story entitled "Padre Filippo's Zeal" is contributed by L. E. Dobrée. . . . Fr. G. Lee, C.S.P., writes on "Sisters and Teachers." He objects to the custom of classifying as a *vocation* the work of the teaching sisterhood, and subordinating the quest for Christian perfection to the service of the classroom. He asks, "Does there not seem a huge impertinence in our saying that such or such persons ought to enter Religion because we want their work, ought, that is, to be consecrated body and soul to their Master because we happen to need their school service?". . . . Three more chapters of Canon Sheehan's novel, *The Blindness of the Reverend Doctor Gray,* appear in this issue. . . . In the Studies and Conferences we find a discussion on a very practical problem, the question of granting Christian burial to a man who had married outside the Church, raised his children as Protestants, and died suddenly without any sign of repentance. The questioner states that some priests believed he should be granted Christian burial on the ground that he might have repented if he had had the time to do so. The answer to the question is a definite negative. . . . Two brief articles on the liturgy in the vernacular are also contributed to this issue.

F. J. C.

COLONIAL PROTESTANTISM AND THE RISE OF DEMOCRACY

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights were the products of the total culture of Colonial America. They were not a foreign fad nor the result of speculation by an esoteric group. Consequently, to understand adequately the inspiring creation of American democracy, insight into the total culture is necessary.

Because of the concrete possibility of a Catholic's becoming a nominee of one of the major political parties in the 1960 campaign for the presidency, attention has been focused on the Catholic position in the total culture that has given rise to our democratic forms. This is not the first time in our national history that the ideas and ideals of our political democracy have become involved with basic religious beliefs.

The purpose here is to consider the way Protestantism in Colonial times developed and changed during the period in which our Revolutionary political thought was shaping itself into the final product of 1789. A religious atmosphere that was more compatible with democracy resulted only after a process of growth in Colonial times. Some observations on the changes which Protestantism underwent from its earliest days in America until the Revolution will show that the Catholic position on fundamental political issues and basic theological dogma suffered much less strain from the rush of Revolutionary events than did the Protestant tenets and attitudes.

First to seize the attention of one who looks at Colonial religion is the *theocracy* of New England. When we reflect on the amendment pertaining to religious freedom in the Bill of Rights, the theocracy of Massachusetts Bay comes to mind. Inimical to the freedom of the First Amendment, the attitude and, indeed, the existence of the New England theocracy was a roadblock of prime importance. Although the complete emancipation from state religion was not accomplished in Massachusetts until 1833, nonetheless, important events took place in Colonial times leading up to this final move. Likewise, many principles that were opposed to religious freedom gave way during that same period of New England's history.

The high period of theocracy in New England was between 1634 and 1688. Congregationalism had the ascendency in the government and, as a consequence, dominated Massachusetts life. Heresy was firmly repressed, but the same firm attitude that destroyed Ann Hutchison evoked brilliant opposition in the form of such ardent advocates of enlarged freedom as Roger Williams.

Thus it was that when the Glorious Revolution of 1688 brought the Toleration Act in its wake, appeals were ready and waiting to be sent to England asking toleration for the minority sects. These appeals won favorable consideration. A primary result was freedom of conscience for the persecuted Quakers. The minority sects benefited from mitigation of laws concerning religious qualification for office-holding and from changes in the tax program. As New England entered the Revolutionary period the theocracy of Winthrop's day was clearly a thing of the past.[1]

A key position in the movement toward more freedom of religion in Colonial times was held by the Quakers, whose doctrine was, in many ways, directly opposed to Calvinism and Lutheranism. Accepting the Lutheran view of private interpretation, Quakerism proceeded to a primitive form of existentialism and constructed a view of man, guided by an "inner light," a view quite divergent from the Lutheran doctrine of depravity. The concept of a universality of God's communication was a direct challenge to Calvinistic ideas on predestination. Thus it was that the Quaker position was quite in opposition to the main religious concepts that had dominated the original New England settlements. The complete freedom of all men to seek this "inner light" was the political consequence of Quaker doctrine.[2]

Quakers made practical application of this doctrine in political life. Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Delaware were among the first states to demand that religious liberty be provided in the first ten amendments to the Constitution. This is not strange when we consider the Quaker influence on the development of these colonies.

---

[1] Cf. Jacob C. Meyer, *Church and State in Massachusetts* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Press, 1930), Introduction. Also, Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934; 4 vols.), I, ch. xxi describes the ascendency of the Puritan regime.

[2] Elbert Russell, *The History of Quakerism* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 179.

The governments of colonial Pennsylvania and Rhode Island were dominated at times by Quakers. The same is true, in a lesser degree, of Delaware.[3]

The wars of Colonial times might have destroyed Quaker influence on American political institutions. In the drift towards war, Quakers, one by one, left the highest offices and legislative posts because of their tenet concerning the morality of war. Fortunately for the cause of religious liberty, the Quakers had a chance to act in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania for a considerable period before the war issues drove them from office. It is interesting to notice how the tradition for religious freedom had become so strong in Pennsylvania that efforts to deprive the Quakers of their political rights (because of the Quaker abstention from the Revolutionary War) fell flat.[4]

There was no such strain put on religious freedom in Rhode Island. There, a large Baptist population had begun a crusade for religious freedom for the neighboring Commonwealth of Massachusetts after the British had been defeated. One may question the altruism of the Baptist attitude toward Quakerism in Rhode Island, if it is realized that any local discrimination against the Quakers would have jeopardized efforts to bring about religious freedom for Baptists in Massachusetts.[5]

At the beginning of her history Virginia possessed the established religion of the mother country. Even after the War of Independence, legislation in favor of a state religion along the lines of Colonial times narrowly missed becoming law. This proposed legislation, however, had quite a different spirit from that of the first days of the Colony. Toleration was to be given other religions, and there was even a willingness to give tax support proportionally to the different sects. The latter move was defeated by a movement supported by Madison and Baptist leaders in Virginia.

Colonial Virginia broadened the general concept of freedom as time passed. A change had thus come about in Protestantism since the time of Virginia's foundation as a Colony. The conditions and events which brought about a change of atmosphere conducive to acceptance of the Constitution and Bill of Rights in Virginia are worth noting.[6]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 202, 203.

[4] For a summary of the treatment given the Quakers, cf. E. F. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America* (Boston: Chipman Law Publishing Company, 1924), ch. v.

[5] W. W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier: The Baptists 1783-1830* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1931), ch. 1.

Virginia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century had not been provided with an adequate clergy, either from the numerical or qualitative points of view. Because there was no resident Anglican bishop in America, administration and discipline suffered. The clergymen sent from England were often malcontents lacking in talent. The local gentry, beginning in the late seventeenth century, chose its clergymen as it pleased.[7] The knowledge of the Anglican doctrine became very limited, and the political implications of church teaching were never stressed.

In these circumstances it is not surprising that the development of political philosophy in Virginia was quite divorced from the dogmatic teachings of the established religion. James Madison was a student at Princeton during the presidency of Jonathan Witherspoon, and some of Madison's thought on religious freedom can be related to this source. Witherspoon, who had shaped his republican views of government under the influence of Montesquieu, was opposed to any form of state religion, such as the Virginia legislature had contemplated after the Revolution.[8] Madison and other leaders of post-Revolutionary Virginia took a good deal of their inspiration for religious freedom from sources that were not theological.

It would not be correct, however, to deny the influence of religion on political thought in Virginia or in any of the other colonies. What seems to have declined was the Protestant thought proper to Calvin and Luther. The fundamental views of man's dignity which Christianity brought to Western Civilization were the foundation stones of the new Republic, as evidenced by the expressions of the colonial patriots.

It was Protestantism's unsatisfactory explanation of man's fall and the supernatural order that was not accepted by some patriots. Adherence was to pre-Reformation thought, and three factors help explain this. In the first place there was no large body of common law in Virginia. As a result, decisions were based on broad fundamental rights which Englishmen had in their Christian tradition.[9] Secondly, the earliest Virginia colonists had arrived in America before Calvinism had been forcefully injected into English thought. Thirdly, there was the influence of the Enlightenment and Deism on the Virginia political leadership.

---

[6] Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (New York: Harpers and Bros., 1950; 3 vols.), III, 207.

[7] Kenneth S. Latourette, *History of the Expansion of Christianity* (New York: Harpers, 1937-1945; 7 vols.), III, 207.

[8] Stokes, *op. cit.*, I, 299.

Because of the great damage done to Christianity by Deism and the Enlightenment, their constructive influence is not always fully appreciated. "When the philosophers of the eighteenth century," Christopher Dawson points out, "attempted to substitute their new rationalist concepts for the ancient faith of Christendom, they were in reality simply abstracting from it those elements which had entered so deeply into their own thought that they no longer recognized their origin."[10]

Their emphasis on the dignity of man opposed the Calvinistic and Lutheran concept and thus, to some degree, expressed the mind of pre-Reformation Christendom. Indeed, if Jefferson is representative of the Virginia patriots of Deist bent, we can conclude that these patriots were not unaware of the Christian origins of the concept of man's dignity. This can be observed in the objection that Jefferson made to Condorcet's contempt for Christianity.[11] Likewise, these American republicans did not associate Christianity with the old political regime in the way that the French philosophers did.

In analyzing the change in religious attitudes of Colonial Virginia in the face of freedom and tolerance, some place must be given to the influence of the minority sects that was evident in the latter part of the seventeenth century and afterwards. These minorities threw their weight behind the efforts to prevent a post-Revolutionary state religion in Virginia. For one hundred years before the Revolution, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Quakers had come into the Virginia frontier areas. The Great Awakening of the early eighteenth century sent large numbers of apostles to this neglected mission field with the result that the minority sects had a considerable membership at the time of the Revolution. The very presence of these sects, aside from their political activity, argued convincingly for broad religious freedom and for curtailment of the established church.[12]

---

[9] Barrett Wendell, "The American Intellect," *The Cambridge Modern History,* Vol. VII, *The United States* (Cambridge, 1903).

[10] Christopher Henry Dawson, *Progress and Religion* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1931), p. 190.

[11] Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The American Spirit* (New York· Macmillan Company, 1942), 81.

Within traditional Calvinistic theology we find Protestantism undergoing another type of change, a change that tended to make for a better reconciliation of theological and political thought. The Great Awakening and Unitarianism were the two movements that were effective in forcing this change of outlook.

The simplest reconciliation in thought would be to assume that religion was concerned exclusively with the salvation of the individual's soul. The Great Awakening of the eighteenth century seemed implicitly to take this stand. The frontier and other neglected areas were a great attraction to zealous young graduates of divinity schools in New England. It was almost in reaction to the theological quibbling and comfortable security of Boston that large numbers took up this urgent apostolate. For these zealous young men the absorbing occupation was religious conversion, not the endless speculation posed by the Enlightenment, which held no certain hope of clarifying dogmatic problems.

This revivalism brought a development of thought that was more in conformity with democracy. Conversion fundamentally supposed that all men had an opportunity for salvation. The problem this presented to Calvinist teachings on predestination is evident. Hence it was that Jonathan Edwards formulated a whole new theology, which he thought was in line with Calvinism. Many did not agree with him, and his victories in the New England pulpit were few. But where there was a hunger for religion (as on the frontier), he brought this message: that all men, by their free efforts, might lift themselves up to a better life. Thus Edwards left a theological impression which, though on analysis might not reduce perfectly to his subtle distinctions on free will, had, nonetheless, a democratic hue which was lacking in an older Calvinism. The thought of Edwards advanced with the successive frontiers of the West.

---

[12] Except in a limited sense the Maryland Toleration Acts were outside the Protestant tradition. The Assembly of 1649 and that of 1639 were made up of a Catholic majority and Catholics passed the famous acts. It can be said, however, that many elements of the Catholic tradition were in time accepted by the Protestants of Maryland, thus resulting in unenforcement of legislation that discriminated against Catholics.

The evangelicalism of which we have been speaking was greatly influenced by other sources. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, and George Whitfield both preached in America after they had initiated similar movements in England. The Quakers, of course, made logical application of their doctrine of the universality of divine revelation and, in the person of the admirable John Woolman, were among the first to be represented in religious revivalism.

The revivalist theology, with its strong emotional flavor, was not favorably received in many of the more established settlements.[13] Here democratic minded men did not hesitate to affirm the essential integrity of human nature in the formulae of Deism and Arminianism. Thus it was that the central position of the theory of natural rights in the fight for independence gave added incentive to the acceptance of heresies that had made earlier inroads into Colonial religious thought. It is clear, too, how Unitarianism sprang up in this same atmosphere.[14] Those whose enthusiasm for democracy and whose optimism for human nature demanded a link with religion could be accommodated by Unitarianism, and the popularity of this sect grew with the surge of nationalism and the ideal of democracy.

On the pedestal of William Ellery Channing's statue this tribute is made to one of Unitarianism's earliest supporters: "He breathed into theology a human spirit." Some hold that if a more optimistic view of human nature had not been breathed into Protestant theology in one way or another, it is difficult to see how the democratic ideal of the New Nation could have been realized.[15] In any event, it was not precisely as a rationalist that Channing discovered a human spirit for theology, but as a student of the New Testament, where he found no man of the Calvinistic description. In this respect there was a return to pre-Reformation theology, though, of course, with appalling limitations.

---

[13] Latourette, *op. cit.,* IV, 429. Francis X. Curran, *Major Trends in American Church History* (New York: America Press, 1946), 75.

[14] Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932), ch. viii.

[15] I am not denying that there was a large repository of Calvinistic and Lutheran thought in later Colonial America. But there is evidence that it had undergone a modification in the direction of Channing's thought—on the practical level with the Great Awakening and theoretically as early as the seventeenth century (cf. Perry Miller's *The New England Mind* [New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939], chs. 13-14).

With its origin in Lollardism, a strain of radical thought ran through all Protestant sects in the Colonies.[16] This tradition is marked by an almost exclusive concern with the *moral* element in religion and by an aversion for any hierarchical organization. It is not necessary for our purposes to evaluate the tradition and its origin, but it can be said that there is evidence of its characteristics in Colonial religious life.

Supposing that the democratic ideal might pose a problem only to the dogmatic in religion, it can be readily seen that the exclusive concern for the moral in religion would clear the way for the acceptance of a democratic government. Their dislike of hierarchy and their preference for popular rule in matters of religion disposed these radical groups for the type of government toward which the Colonies had developed.

The Constitutional debates and the post-War period in general would call for a treatment of the way in which the changed religious attitudes of large groups of Americans made it possible to have large-scale acceptance of the democratic ideal, an acceptance that would not have been possible had the earlier Protestant dogma prevailed. This is an interesting development for the Catholic student of political thought, since the Catholic position as affirmed as early as 1639 did not have to undergo change in order to accept the Constitution's political ideals.[17] An appreciation of this historical situation brings out the startling incongruity of the Catholic religion being the only one in 1960 to be measured for compatibility with the Constitution.

Thus the political thought which fashioned the Constitution and its Bill of Rights was not out of joint with the religious thought of the post-Revolutionary period of American history; this was caused, however, by Protestantism's progress toward a truer concept of man and religious freedom. This was a gain for Protestant theology, and it was likewise a gain for the political order, which was constituted by a dominantly Protestant membership. Democracy, or another form of social ideal, is dangerous unless it be integrated securely in the ultimates of religion. Above all, the vigor of men who harmonize in truth both the political and the religious orders of reality will be the great factors in the triumphs of democracy and religion.

---

[16] Thomas C. Hall, *Religious Background of American Culture* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1930).

[17] See the following studies of the writer: *Their Rights and Liberties* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959); "Catholic Political Thought in Colonial Maryland Government," *Historical Bulletin*, XXXII (Nov., 1953), 27-34; "Church and State in the Maryland Ordinance of 1639," *Church History*, XXVI (Dec., 1957), 325-341.

THOMAS O'BRIEN HANLEY, S.J.

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wis.

SAINT AUGUSTINE: THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER

II

St. Augustine looked upon his work of preaching as a work by which the grace of God was applied to the souls of men. It is, above all, a means used by God to enable a man to understand the supernatural better, to understand himself, and his role in the plan of God.

The sermon helps a man to know himself more completely and realistically. He does this, however, by concentrating not on the preacher but on himself, by seeing, *interiore conspectu,* what his own way of thinking is, what is his desire, what is his life.[1] The inner eye needs to see if self-knowledge is to generate knowledge of God: *noverim me, noverim Te.* Why? The ignorance of a presented truth is not due to a refusal of the Inner Teacher to illumine but to the weakness of the individual who has not yet experienced enough to recognize the truth or keen enough to interpret it for himself. The listener, therefore, trains himself to look within where "no noise, no disputation, no strife or debatings" stifle the birth of thought. Once within, he trains himself to be "meek to hear the word so that he may understand."[2] Thought is born in the silence of the Light; to turn away from the Light is to become blind. He may not sense this punishment but he has it nevertheless.[3] Thought is aborted.

The African laity could not be ignorant of these truths, so often were they driven home by their Bishop. The truths themselves are applications of the central theme of Augustinian thought: we only experience the God of Love by ascending from the macrocosm of sense and perception (e.g., the words and figures of the preacher) to the inward microcosm of thought and intelligence.[4] The whole structure of Augustine's sermons, then, are based on introspection. Make the people forget the preacher. Provoke thought. Once thinking, they will be more apt to enter into a loving prayer with God. Sermons should achieve this intimate dialogue of the soul with God. The preacher leads the creature to be alone with his Creator. Consequently the listener must never think that the preacher is nearer to him than God is. No, "God is much more present. I am but visible to your eyes. God presides in your consciences. Give to me your ears, to Him your heart, that both may be filled."[5]

---

[1] *In Joh.* 90, 1 (35: 1859).

[2] *Serm.* 52,9,22 (38: 364).

[3] *Serm.* 117,4,5 (38: 664).

[4] Augustine "inculcates into us the fact that the soul can only find God by a return and a process *ad intus,* in withdrawing from all things and from senses, in preparation for an ascension within. He wishes to be united in the profoundest depths of the heart of Him who dwells there as in a temple and in whom alone the heart can find rest, . . . the God of the saints, the Life of our life." Jacques Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge* (New York:

If the preacher is to use his words properly, his "first and greatest endeavor should be to make himself understood as much as possible by clearness of style—*perspicuitate dicendi.*"[6] The Augustine who was concerned with eloquent niceties in his pre-episcopal days writes near the end of his life that the preacher should show more care in being clear than in being eloquent. "Sometimes an assiduous striving after clearness disregards the more elegant expressions and is not concerned about what sounds well, but only about what reveals and makes satisfactory what one is desiring to express."[7] At times, idiomatic, even incorrect expressions that go against the code of the purists can be used if "it avoids ambiguity and obscurity."[8] For example, Augustine can replace the grammatically correct *feneratur* with *fenerat,* for "what does it matter what the schoolmasters think? Better that you should understand our barbarism than be left high and dry with our pedantic exactitude."[9]

Scribners Sons, 1937), p. 366. "Transcende et corpus et sape animum; transcende et animum, et sape Deum," *In Joh.* 20,21 (35:1562). Cf. *De Trin.* 8,7,11 (42:957); 10,8,11 (979).

[5] *In Joh.* 1,7 (35:1382).

[6] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,8,12 (34:99). Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 3, 48-51; Quintilian's "Perspicuitas in verbis praecipuam habet proprietatem," *Institutio Oratoria,* 8,2,1. On this classical tradition, cf. M. Comeau, *Rhétorique de st. Augustin d'apres les Tractatus in Johannem* (Paris: Boeven, 1930), pp. 3-4, 11-12.

[7] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,10,24 (34:99); 4,9,23 (99); *Conf.* 1,18,28 (32:674). What good is it if there is correct eloqution but the hearer does not understand, *De Doc. Christ.* 2,13,19-20 (44-45); 3,3,7 (68).

[8] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,10,24 (34:100). "If he can employ other correct and intelligible words, he will do better to employ them," *ibid.*

[9] *In Ps.* 36,3,6 (36:386). He uses *ossum* for *os,* for "it is better to have the masters take us to task than that the people should not understand," *In Ps.* 138,20 (37:1796). Lest this principle be misinterpreted, the examples

Augustine himself kept a choice and noble diction although descending to the daily language of the people. He used a language that conformed to the norms of Latin literature codified by classical authors, yet remained a living language, adapted to a public speaking—a Latin already evolving into the beginnings of the romance tongues. Furthermore, he gradually developed a vocabulary that accurately eased the tension between scientific theological precision and the popular language, thereby establishing for many centuries the norms of ecclesiastical Latin.[10]

The obligation of clearness involves *all* those truths the preacher himself perceives or hears from the One Teacher. His duty extends beyond those matters which entail no work to make clear. "As we hear, so should we teach,"[11] and "we should do this no matter how much labor of reasoning is entailed!"[12] This duty of explaining *everything* and explaining everything *clearly* greatly taxed the brilliant bishop:

> Often, burning with desire to help our hearer, we wish to express ourselves in exact accord with our understanding of the matter at that moment, but find that, due to the very strain of our mental efforts, we cannot speak; and then, because of our failure, we are vexed and, as though we were having our pains for naught, we wilt from weariness. As a result of this weariness, our discourse itself becomes more dull than it was at the moment it first caused listlessness.[13]

Inadequate speech is "a poor and mean thing"; it is disappointing because it does not answer the demands of the mind.[14] Speaking

---

Augustine gives almost always refer to the barbarisms in the inaccurate old Latin biblical texts. Cf. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique,* pp. 537-539.

[10] Henri Marrou, *St. Augustin et l'augustinisme,* pp. 58-59. Ad. Regnier, *De la latinité des sermons de s. Augustin* (Paris: Libraire Hachette, 1886). Christine Mohrmann, "Let latin commune et le latin des chrétiens," *Vigilae Christianae,* I (1954), 1-12; "Les vulgaires éléments du latin des chrétiens," *ibid.,* II (1948), 163-184. Christine Mohrmann has shown how Augustine used a style and vocabulary in his sermons *(Volksrhetorik)* that differs considerably from that in his writings *(Schulrhetorik)*. For example, there are words and rhetorical devices in *The City of God* that are *totally* absent in his sermons. *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin* (Nijmegen: Dekker, 1932), esp. pp. 18-21, 26.

[11] *Serm.* 261,2 (38:1203). Cf. *Serm.* 292,1 (1320); *In Joh.* 16,3 (35:1524).

[12] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,9,23 (34:99). Cf. *Contra Cresconium* 1,15,19 (43:457).

[13] *De Cat. Rud.* 2,3 (40:1312).

[14] *Ibid.; ibid.,* 10,14 (40:1321).

of the omnipresence of the Verbum, Augustine reaches for a word, *vehiculum verbi,* but confesses that "what I am saying within myself I seek to say to you, but words fail."[15] The audience would agree with him if they could see his thought, and precisely because they have not exact and moving words before them, he senses lame results. In explaining *timor castus,* he can only acknowledge: "If God would only help me to give fitting expression to the meaning of this fear, there is little doubt that many hearts would be inflamed with the highest love *(in amorem castum).*"[16] This frustration of the inadequate word causes Augustine to confess that "I am nearly always dissatisfied with my discourses."[17]

Frankly, a diligent reading of all of Augustine's sermons reveals this frustration to the student. Augustine is faced with that gift of genius that views and directly understands both natural and supernatural realities in a way never apprehended before, either by himself or by others. There is the bewilderment of saying something for the first time and the helplessness of pouring new wine into old skins, accommodating old words to new ideas. Intuitions are constant. He has to express the "one, rapid draught imbibed by the mind by long and devious paths through lips of flesh."[18] Often by the time he forms his speech and selects his correct word, the "intellectual apprehension has already hidden itself in [the mind's] secret recesses."[19] Like Pindar and St. Paul, Augustine is often at the mercy of ideas exploding in chain-reaction, pressing to his lips in such swift sequence and imperious clamor for expression that it puts a severe strain on human language to yield words equal to their demands.

Augustine wearies, but he looks to Christ. The God-Man "did not disdain to stoop to the ears of the weak." He listened to small and petty problems and the Verbum Himself uttered answers in simple words, knowing full well that they could never express the totality of Divine Wisdom. Because Christ loved men, He was willing, like a nurse cherishing her children, to murmur into their ears "broken and mutilated words."[20] If the preacher loves men in Christ, he rejoices not only in the delights of the intellect with its unsullied penetralia but also "in understanding how love, the more graciously it descends to the lowliest station . . . will the more irresistibly find its way into the inmost recesses of the heart, through the testimony of a good conscience that seeks nothing of those to whom it descends except their eternal salvation."[21] In other words, the preacher *loves to teach.*

---

[15] *Serm.* 120,2 (38:677).

[16] *In Epist. Joh.* 9,2 (35:2046). ". . . Things to be thought rather than spoken, lest perchance what worthy thing the soul conceives from these words, the tongue would fail to unfold," *In Joh.* 56,1 (35:1783).

[17] *De Cat. Rud.* 2,3 (40:1311). He hopes that his audience will understand that a man "may feel something which he cannot express," *Serm.* 117,5,7 (38:665). St. Paul mentions his fullness of knowledge (γνῶσις) but inadequate speech (λόγος), II Cor. 11:6.

[18] *De Cat. Rud.* 10,15 (40:1322).

[19] *Ibid.,* 2,3 (1311).

The stress on *docere* does not mean that Augustine neglects the beauty of the vessel, the ornamental word. Rhetoric is divorced from life whenever it is divorced from depth. Christian truths brought life back to form, and Augustine gladly accepts the form. He teaches that some men, once they have been taught the truth, are satisfied to feast upon it with delight, "but as eating and learning have some similariy, even the very food without which we cannot live must be seasoned to satisfy the tastes of the majority."[22] The preacher "pleases" in the measure that it will be useful to attract and retain the attention of the audience. Augustine insists that *placere* is rigidly subordinate to *docere* and *movere.* Those who have studied Augustine's rhetorical style point out his unusual measure of coining phrases and manipulating words, using spontaneously rhetorical figures that charm but do not detract from the thought. Much of this is unconscious. As Marrou remarks, Augustine, like M. Jourdain with his prose, used rhetoric without knowing it.[23]

---

[20] *Ibid.,* 10,15 (1322). The *decurta et mutilata* refer to the baby-talk used by nurses.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,11,26 (34:101).

[23] Augustine readily backs up Cicero's formal condemnation of an insipid eloquence that has no other end than its own esthetical perfection of forms. *De Doc. Christ.* 4,5,7 (34:91-92). "[Augustine] does not have the irony of an Asterius, nor the supple and expressive realism of a Chrysostom. He is far from the artistic solemnity of an Ambrose, and no trace can be found of the majesty of a Leo the Great; but for surety and precision of word, he surpasses all the Fathers of the Church," F. Van der Meer, *op. cit.,* II, 205. On his style, cf. *ibid.,* II, 204-264; Marrou, *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique,* pp. 505-540; Sister M. Inviolata Barry, *Saint Augustine the*

Although *docere* is necessary and *placere* useful, the primary purpose of the sermon is persuasion: *movere*. "Unless he persuades, he does not reach the goal of his eloquence."[24] All persuasions center around good morals that must be loved and evil ones that must be avoided. Even if members of the audience are already convinced of this, are already practicing good lives, the preacher continues to move them "to do so more zealously and persevere more steadfastly." Augustine writes:

> To the art of pleasing those whose pampered tastes truth does not satisfy, unless it be presented in an agreeable fashion, no small place has been assigned in eloquence. Yet when this art has been added, it does not satisfy the obstinate who have benefited neither from having understood, nor from having been pleased by, the teacher's style. What use are these two to a man who both acknowledges the truth and praises the eloquence, but does not yield his consent, *although it is only for this consent that the speaker gives careful attention to the matter which he is discussing when urging something?* If the things being taught are of such a nature that belief in them and knowledge of them are sufficient, yielding consent is nothing else than acknowledging that they are true. But when what is being taught must be carried out, and when the teaching occurs for that very reason, we are *uselessly persuaded of the truth of what is said and uselessly pleased by the very manner in which it is said, if we do not learn it in such a way that we practice it.*[25]

The preacher, then, stresses the importance of giving *real* assents —loving convictions of the truths of faith and reason. Move the people to *love* the truth; this embrace will move them to act, for no one will act by compulsion, only by loving conviction. "When men act by compulsion and not by conviction, the attempt to make them give up a great evil and hold to a great good produces more labor than profit."[26]

Orator (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press) —a statistical analysis that forces the *Volksrhetorik,* writes Mohrmann, into scientific categories; Mohrmann, *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones;* C.-I. Balmus, *Style de s. Augustin* (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1930); M. Comeau, *op. cit.;* Joseph Finaert, *Saint Augustin Rhéteur* (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1939); F. di Capua, "Il ritmo prosaico in S. Agostino," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* (Rome, 1931), esp. pp. 750-64 on sermon style.

[24] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,25,55 (34:116). "Non faciunt bonos mores nisi boni amores," *Serm.* 311,11 (38:1417).

[25] *De Doc. Christ.* 4,13,29 (34:102).

[26] *Epist.* 100,2 (33:367).

The will itself can prevent the listener from grasping the truth and loving it. "There is no greater impediment to the perception of truth than a life devoted to passion." Consequently, restraint of carnal excesses, gluttony, jealousy, and detraction prepares one for knowledge of God's law.[27] Although every soul, then, can consult God, only the "pious, chaste, and diligent quest"[28] will arrive at a better comprehension of certain truths, especially moral truths. There are some truths the "impious" cannot recognize, whereas these same truths are visible to men striving earnestly and piously —this, because they accept God's illuminating grace.[29] The Light is not absent from the unrighteous and the impious; *they* are absent from the Light.[30]

What is the chief motive-force in Augustine's sermons? The driving force of *eternity*—the ultimate end where we shall reap according as we have sown. To Augustine the hereafter is far more real than the present visible universe. He and his flock lived as on pilgrimage, as he notes:

> Because every pilgrim has his own land—for nobody is a pilgrim who has not a fatherland—we ought to know what our land is; where, with all the enticements and delights of this life put aside, we should hasten; where we are going; and where alone it is permitted to take our rest.[31]

Sermon after sermon describes this eternal fatherland, dwells on the joys in store for us as contrasted with the pleasures of this world. Our hearts must be cleansed "from all earthly and secular affections" and set on their true goal:

> You dare not put wheat on the damp earth lest it rot; this, because you have toiled and winnowed it. Do you seek a spot for your wheat and seek not a place for your heart? Don't you seek a place for your treasure? . . . How many are there here of my listeners whose heart is nowhere but in their moneybags? You are of the earth because what you love is of the earth. Let that be sent to heaven, and there will be your heart.[32]

---

[27] *De Vera Rel.* 3,3 (34: 124).

[28] *De Mag.* 11,36 (32: 1215).

[29] *De Vera Rel.* 10,20 (34: 131).

[30] "Praesens est sapientia sed cum caeco praesens est, oculis eius absens est; non qui ipsa illi absens est, sed quia ipse ab illa absens est," *In Joh.* 1,19 (35: 1388).

[31] *Serm.* 12,1 (Mai edition).

[32] *In Ps.* 90,2,13 (37: 1169-1170).

We have the promise of Christ, "I will not disappoint you, I who have purified your heart."[33] This purification is for everybody; perfection is for everybody. Once Augustine conceived the heights to which men can rise in the love of Christ, he urged all men to reach the highest possible degree of love. Morality cannot be static. It is not a system for finding the point below which no man can go without losing his soul. Morality is a system which moves constantly upwards, almost imperceptibly fusing itself with the "spiritual," even the "mystical," life. No man has done his duty until he has been completely filled with love of God. Because man can never do this, his very perfection on earth is to know that he is imperfect and cannot stand still.[34] He must be pleased with nothing but perfection, always displeased with what he is, in order to attain to what he is not: *si autem dixeris, "Sufficit," et peristi.*[35]

The whole aim of preaching, accordingly, is this purification of desires and constant appraisal of oneself before God:

> Our whole business is to heal the eye of the heart whereby God may be seen. To this end are celebrated the Holy Mysteries; to this end is preached the Word of God. To this end are directed the moral exhortations of the Church; to this end is directed the whole of Scripture—that the inner man may be purged of that which hinders us from the sight of God.[36]

Because of the importance of this purgation, we grasp Augustine's conscientiousness to speak out on sin. A shepherd refuses to be silent; it is the hireling who "stands still in body but flies in heart when he sees a sinner and does not say, 'You sin.' "[37] The Bishop understands that pagans must be dealt with "softly that they may hear the truth," but to his Christian hearers he says, "In you, corruption must be cut out."[38] Yet he is tactful even in his blunt reproofs. He knows, for example, many are secretly committing adultery, using the excuse that God pays no attention to sins of the flesh:

---

[33] *In Joh.* 21,15 (35:1572).

[34] "Ipsa est perfectio hominis, invenisse se non esse perfectum," *Serm.* 170,8 (38:931).

[35] *Serm.* 169,15,18 (38:926).

[36] *Serm.* 88,5 (38:542). This idea is a striking application to what Gilson terms remediable dissimilarity. Man is the image of God, like to God, yet he strives continuously to become more and more similar to the Prototype by opening the mind to the illumination of the Divine Reformer, *In Ps.* 42,6 (36:480); 146,14 (37:1841). E. Gilson, "'Regio Dissimilitudinis' de Platon à Saint Bernard," *Medieval Studies,* IX (1947), esp. 121-128.

[37] *Serm.* 137,12 (38:761).

[38] *Serm.* 62,8,11 (420).

> Let the reproof in secret be of service to you now. For I am speaking openly yet I reprove in secret. I knock at the ears of all, but I accost the consciences of some. If I were to say, "You adulterer, reform yourself," perhaps I may say what I have no knowledge of, perhaps I suspect a hearsay report. I do not say, therefore, "You adulterer, reform yourself," but, "Whosoever among these people is an adulterer, reform yourself." So the reproof is public, but the reformation secret—*publica est correptio, sed secreta correctio.*[39]

Of course, some will hear the word and not keep it. Yet the sower must sow. "If he has been afraid of these unmanageable grounds (the *difficiles*), he would never have sown on good ground" in which sanctity flowers.[40] "The faithful preacher of righteousness may be rejected by men, but dream not that he will be deprived by God of the reward due to the fulfillment of his duty."[41] The fondest hope of the preacher, nevertheless, is that both flock and shepherd carry out their corresponding duties:

> If I speak out to you, I save my own soul; but if I am silent, I am not merely in great danger, I am already condemned to destruction. But when I have spoken out and thus fulfilled my duty, look to your own danger. For what do I desire or wish? What yearnings have I? Why do I address you? Why do I sit here? Nay, why do I live at all except for this one object: that we may live together in Christ? This is my one desire, my glory, my honor, my joy, my one possession. But if you do not hear me and if I have not held my tongue, I shall save my soul. *But I do not wish to save my soul without you.*[42]

Although Augustine appreciates the close attention of his audiences, he is quick to remind them that the preacher is satisfied only when actions follow his words. "When does the laborer in the field work with joy? When he looks at the tree and sees the fruit; when he looks at the crop and sees the prospect of abundance of corn on the floor; when he sees that he has not labored in vain, bowed his back and bruised his hands, endured the cold and heat in vain."[43] In sermon sixty-one, for example, the Bishop lists the reasons for the obligations of almsgiving. Toward the end of the sermon he intimately tells why he chose the topic. The poor of Hippo, dressed in rags and filled with little sustenance, approached him several times on his way to church, begging the Bishop to preach on almsgiving. "When they see that they receive nothing from you, they suppose that all my labor among you is in vain." He says that he has given to the poor but his small pocket cannot satisfy the demand. He comes before his people, therefore, as an "ambassador of the poor." His audience, so moved, applauds. Observing the reaction, Augustine continues, "You have received the seed, you have returned an answer. . . . My brethren, these praises are but the tree's leaves; it is the fruit that I am in quest of."[44]

---

[39] *Serm.* 82,9,12 (512).

[40] *Serm.* 101,3 (607).

[41] *C. Cresconium* 1,5,7 (43:450).

[42] *Serm.* 17,2 (125).

[43] *Serm.* 82,12,15 (514).

In all his reproofs towards sinners, Augustine displays the utmost kindness. Because of his own past he is aware of the horrors of sin. "Of truth, my brethren, God has so willed that I am a priest. I am also a sinner. With you, I beat the breast. With you I ask for pardon. With you I hope that God will be merciful."[45] In the apparent quiet of late years, the Bishop acknowledges that he still fights the battle of the flesh and adds that he well realizes how strong the battle is in the young.[46] And to those who have preserved a virginity of mind by fully embracing all matters of faith from their youth, he preaches:

> In what tranquillity do *you* learn, who as yet are little ones in the nest of the faith and receive spiritual food. But wretch that *I* was! Thinking myself capable of flying, I left the nest and fell before I could fly. Yet the Lord of Mercy raised me up and put me in the nest again that I might not be trodden on and killed by those passing by.[47]

This very sympathy and encouragement helps the preacher to move the audience to action. Compassion toward the misery of the sinner is commendable and necessary, "yet the man who is fraternally compassionate would prefer to find nothing in others to need his compassion."[48] Thus, Augustine preaches with sympathy in order to eliminate the very reasons for that sympathy. He hopes that both preacher and audience will do good in the Lord's field "that at the reward we may rejoice together."[49]

---

[44] *Serm.* 61,13 (414) ; cf. *Serm.* 86,17 (530).

[45] *Serm.* 135,6,7 (749) ; cf. *Serm.* 56,11 (382) ; 17,6 (127).

[46] *Serm.* 128,9,11 (718-719).

[47] *Serm.* 51,6 (336-337). Far more praiseworthy than the virginity of the body is the virginity of the mind, for "in inviolate faith, there is preserved a kind of virginal chastity," *De Sancta Virgin.*, 48,48 (40 : 425). Cf. *In Joh.* 13,12 (35 : 1499) ; *Serm.* 93.4 (38 : 574-575) ; *In Ps.* 147,10 (37 : 1920). Few authors treat of Augustine's contrition for *both* losses. Cf. René Hesbert, O.S.B., "Saint Augustin et la virginité de la foi," *Augustinus Magister,* II, 645-55.

Even if the preacher himself is living immorally, the hearers must not excuse their own sins. If you have a preacher of evil life in your midst, do not imitate him; imitate Christ who is preaching to you through the preacher.[50] Consider his deeds as thorns and his words as grapes—learn how to select.[51] The layman says, "Let me walk in the way of the Lord, not follow this man's conduct. Let me hear from him not his words but God's. I will follow God. Let him follow his own lust."[52] The hireling may be preaching for his own glory or despite his own life, but if the word of salvation comes from his lips, believe the word, for it is Christ who saves, not the preacher. The harm is done to the preacher; the gain accrues to the listener.[53]

No doubt a preacher, looking over the successful effects of his sermons, is tempted to think *he* has brought about the good actions of the flock. A "successful" dispenser of the word can even unconsciously give a Pelagian taint to his efforts. Not Augustine. We observed how carefully and humbly he saw the role of Teacher and teacher in the sermon. The only true Teacher is God. Likewise, in moving an audience either to love the truth or carry their loving convictions into daily actions, Augustine bows to the Author of Grace. In the prime of Augustine's preaching career, the notions of Pelagius were beginning to attract attention. Among Augustine's many attacks against Pelagianism is a paragraph profitable for every preacher. Of those with a Pelagian taint in themselves, he says:

> [They] think that their exhortations that others lead a good and holy life are efficacious only when . . . they make the whole depend on man's

---

[48] *Conf.* 3,2,3 (32:684).
[49] *Serm.* 82,12,15 (38:514).
[50] *In Joh.* 5,19 (35:1424).
[51] *Serm.* 137,11,13 (38:762).
[52] *Ibid.*, 7 (758).
[53] *Ibid.*, 5 (757).

powers unaided by the gifts of God, and regard it as solely produced by the exercise of man's free will; as though one's free will could do anything to perfect a good work unless first freed by the gift of God. They do not realize that it is owing to the *gift of God* that they, by their free will, can exhort men to embrace a good life, stimulate the sluggish, kindle the frigid, correct the perverse, convert people who have turned away from God, and pacify the rebellious. *Only by this [the gift of God] can they persuade men to do what they urge.* If they do not achieve these results in the wills of men, how do they achieve them? No matter what gift of speech a person may have, no matter if by his skill in disputation and unction of speech he can implant truth in a man's will, foster in him a love of God, root up his errors through instruction, and by his exhortations rouse him from sloth, "neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the growth (I Cor. 3:7)." *In vain does a gardener toil with all his might from without if the Creator does not work in a hidden fashion within.*[54]

THOMAS F. STRANSKY, C.S.P.

St. Paul's College
Washington 17, D. C.

---

[54] *De Bono Vid.* 18,22 (40:444 f.).

THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AND CHRISTIAN REUNION

Since the historic Septuagesima Sunday when Pope John XXIII first announced his plan to summon an ecumenical council in the near future, most of the references to this assembly in the secular press have, in one way or another, included some mention of that reunion of dissident Christians with the true Church which the Holy Father hopes to foster by means of, or at least on the occasion of, the council. Furthermore, the daily papers have carried rather frequent stories about the willingness or unwillingness of certain non-Catholic religious dignitaries to attend the future council, in the event that they would be invited to do so. As a result our Catholic people have been put in a position in which they can derive considerable intellectual profit from precise and accurate information about the true function of an ecumenical council of the Catholic Church in relation to the return of dissident Christians to the one true fold of Jesus Christ.

Fortunately, authoritative sources of such information are readily available. During the month of September, 1868, Pope Pius IX issued two very important documents containing invaluable teaching about the effects he hoped the then forthcoming Vatican Council would produce in the direction of Christian reunion. The first of these was the letter *Arcano divinae Providentiae,* addressed "to all the Bishops of the Churches of Oriental Rite not in communion with the Apostolic See." The second, the *Iam vos omnes,* was directed "to all Protestants and to other Non-Catholics." The *Arcano divinae Providentiae* is dated September 8. The *Iam vos omnes* was sent out five days later.

Both of these letters aimed at one ultimate objective, the return of the dissidents to whom they were addressed to the one true Church and company of Jesus Christ. Each document indicated the way in which the future ecumenical council could be instrumental in contributing to such a return, for the schismatic Eastern Bishops, and for the Protestants. Although the ultimate objective of both letters is identical, the immediate response Pope Pius IX sought from the dissident Bishops of the Eastern rites was definitely not the same as the immediate response he sought to obtain from his Protestant readers. A comparison of the immediate objectives of the two documents is most instructive, not only in terms of the theology of the ecumenical council, but also with reference to the divine constitution of the true Church of God in the dispensation of the New Testament. Such a comparison demands an examination of the contents of both letters.

The following is a translation of the *Arcano divinae Providentiae,* the first and the shorter of the two documents.

TO ALL BISHOPS OF CHURCHES OF ORIENTAL RITE
NOT HAVING COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE
POPE PIUS IX

Constituted by the secret counsel of divine providence, although through no merits of Our own, successors in this glorious See of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles who, according to the prerogative granted him by God, is the firm and most solid rock upon which the Saviour has built His Church, We, urged on by the solicitude of the burden imposed upon Us, most strongly desire and are trying to extend Our care to all of those in every part of the world who are counted as Christians, and to urge them towards the embrace of paternal charity. For We cannot neglect any portion of the Christian people without grave danger to Our soul. He who has been redeemed by the most precious blood of Our Saviour and brought into the Lord's flock by the sacred waters of baptism rightly requires all Our vigiliance in his own behalf. And so, since it is Our duty unceasingly to concentrate all of Our efforts and Our thoughts towards the obtaining of salvation for all of those who acknowledge and adore Christ Jesus, We turn Our eyes and Our paternal heart to those Churches which once, joined in the bond of union with this Apostolic See, flourished with such splendor of holiness and of heavenly doctrine, and brought forth abundant fruits of divine glory and of the salvation of souls, but which now, through the nefarious arts and machinations of the one who first stirred up division in heaven, are, to Our great sorrow, separated and divided from the communion of the holy Roman Church which is spread abroad throughout the entire world.

It was for this very reason that, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, We have, with an entire affection of the heart, spoken words of peace and of charity to you. And although these words of Ours have not produced the result We so greatly desired, still We have never ceased to hope that the most clement and benign Author of salvation and of peace will graciously deign to grant Our humble and fervent prayers. He it is who has produced salvation in the midst of the earth, who, rising from the deep, manifestly showing that peace which is acceptable to Him and which must be accepted by all, has announced it at His birth by the ministry of angels to men of good will. While He lived among men, He taught that peace by His words and preached it by His example.

Now since recently, with the advice of Our venerable brothers, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, We have summoned and convoked an ecumenical council to be held in Rome next year, and which is to open on the eighth of December, the feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God, We again direct Our voice to you and, with all the power of Our soul, We beseech, We admonish, and We beg you to be willing to come to this same general council, just as your elders gathered at the Second Council of Lyons, held by Our predecessor of glorious memory, Blessed Gregory X, and at the Council of Florence, which was called by Our predecessor of happy memory, Eugenius IV; so that, with the laws of the ancient charity renewed, and with the peace of the Fathers, that heavenly and salutary gift of Christ which has for a time withered away, restored again to vigor, after the long cloud of sorrow and the dark and unpleasant mist of long standing strife, the radiance of the union We have hoped for may shine forth.

And may this be the most joyous fruit of the blessing by which Christ Jesus, the Lord and Redeemer of us all, consoles His immaculate and most beloved Spouse, the Catholic Church, and restrains and wipes away its tears in these harsh times, so that, with all the division entirely removed, the voices that were formerly raised against each other may, with perfect unanimity of spirit, praise God who wills not that there should be schisms among us, but who, by the voice of the Apostle, ordered that we should all have the same teachings and the same sentiments. And may undying thanks be given always to the Father of mercies from all His Saints, and especially from those most glorious ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Eastern Churches, when from heaven they behold the restored and reintegrated union with this Apostolic See which is the center of Catholic truth and unity. While they were living on earth they strove, both by doctrine and by example, with every effort and with untiring labor, to foster that union and to promote it always more and more. Through the Holy Ghost there was diffused in their hearts the charity of Him who has broken down the wall that divided the vineyard, and who has conciliated and given peace to all by His blood, who willed that the sign of His disciples should be found in their unity, and who petitioned His Father: I pray that they all may be one, as We are One.[1]

---

[1] The text of the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* is found in the *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani,* edited by the Jesuit

When we come to analyze this letter, we find that its content hinges on these basic considerations:

(1) The Pope acknowledges that his position obliges him to do all that he can to bring all baptized persons towards the attainment of their ultimate salvation, which can be had only within the Catholic Church.

(2) He has hitherto worked and prayed for the destruction of the schism which has separated the Eastern Churches over which the bishops to whom this letter is addressed preside from the Roman Church.

(3) He begs these bishops to repair to the forthcoming Vatican Council as their elders did to the Second Ecumenical Council of Lyons and to the Ecumenical Council of Florence.

(4) He indicates the blessings necessarily resultant from such a course.

Now we should consider the content of the *Iam vos omnes,* of which the following is a translation.

TO ALL PROTESTANTS AND TO OTHER NON-CATHOLICS

POPE PIUS IX

By this time you all know well that We, who all undeserving, have been placed upon this chair of Peter, and thus divinely put in charge of the supreme government of and the care for the entire Catholic Church, entrusted to Us by Christ Our Lord Himself, have judged it opportune to call to Ourselves the Venerable Brother Bishops of the entire world, and to gather them into an ecumenical council which is to be held next year. We have done this so that We may be able to take counsel with these same Venerable Brethren who have been called to share in Our solicitude, as to what may be opportune and necessary, both to dissipate the darkness of so many pestiferous errors, which, with the greatest harm to souls rule and rage everywhere daily, and to build up and increase in the Christian people confided to Our care the kingdom of the true faith, of justice, and of God's true peace. During all the time of Our Supreme Pontificate, these Venerable Brethren have never

---

Fathers of Maria Laach, and published by Herder in Freiburg im Breisgau in 1892, columns 7 f. It is also in Cecconi's *Histoire du Concile du Vatican* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1887), I, 387-90.

ceased to manifest towards Us and towards this See the most splendid testimonies of faith, love, and reverence. Thus, completely confident in the most powerful and affectionate bond of union by which these same Venerable Brethren are attached to Us and to this Apostolic See, We are borne up by the hope that, just as other general councils have done in centuries gone by, so now in this century the ecumenical council We have called, may, with the help of God's grace, produce rich and most joyous results for the greater glory of God and for the eternal salvation of men.

And so, strengthened in that hope and stirred up and impelled by the charity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who delivered up His soul for the salvation of the entire human race, We could not, on the occasion of this future council, do other than address Our apostolic and fatherly words to all of those who, although acknowledging the same Jesus Christ as the Redeemer, and glorying in the Christian name, still neither profess the true Catholic faith nor follow the communion of the Catholic Church. And we are doing this so that, in all care and charity, We may warn them, exhort them, and beseech them as powerfully as We can that they may be willing seriously to consider and to think as to whether they themselves are following the way which has been prescribed by that same Christ the Lord and which leads to eternal salvation. And certainly no one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ Himself, in order that He might apply the fruits of His redemption to all human generations, has built His only Church, that is, the one, holy, Catholic, apostolic Church, here on earth, upon Peter. No one can deny or doubt that He has given it all the power necessary so that the deposit of faith might be kept integral and inviolate, and that this same faith might be delivered to all peoples, races, and nations: so that through baptism all men might be incorporated into His Mystical Body, and that the new life of grace, without which no one can ever merit and attain eternal life, may always be conserved and perfected in them: and so that this same Church, which He has constituted His Mystical Body, might always remain and flourish fixed and unchanged in its own proper nature until the consummation of the world, and that it might supply all the aids to salvation to all of its children. But now whoever accurately considers and meditates upon the condition of the various and mutually disagreeing religious societies separated from the Catholic Church, which from the time of Christ the Lord and His Apostles has, through legitimate sacred pastors, always continually exercised and even now is exercising the divine power delivered to it by the Lord Himself, ought easily to persuade himself that neither any individual one of these societies nor all of them taken together can in any way constitute or be that one and Catholic Church which Christ the Lord has established and has willed to exist, nor is in any way a member or a part of that Church, as long as these societies are visibly separated from the Catholic unity.

Since societies of this kind lack that living and God-given authority, which teaches men especially matters of faith and the discipline of morals, and directs and guides them in all those things that pertain to eternal salvation, these societies differ continuously in their teachings, and this mobility and instability never ceases to affect them.

Everyone easily understands, and knows clearly and evidently that this situation is incompatible with that of the Church established by Christ the Lord, in which the truth is meant to remain unchanged and to continue unaffected by any variations whatsoever, as a deposit delivered to that same Church to be guarded in all its integrity, and for the custody of which the presence and the help of the Holy Ghost have been promised to the Church forever.

No one is ignorant of the fact that from such conflicts of doctrines and opinions social discords arise, and that from such discords the innumerable groups and sects which are spread abroad more and more every day, to the harm of both the Christian and the civil commonwealths, derive their origin.

Whoever recognizes religion as the foundation of human society cannot but acknowledge and admit that such division and conflict of principles and of religious societies fighting against one another has exerted great influence in civil society. Such a man cannot help but acknowledge and admit that the denial of the authority established by God to direct the persuasions of the human mind and to guide the actions of men in both private and in social life has powerfully promoted and strengthened those most unfortunate movements and disturbances of affairs in our times by which almost all peoples are miserably shaken and afflicted.

Hence, let all of those who do not hold the unity and the truth of the Catholic Church avail themselves of the occasion of this council, by which the Catholic Church, to which their forefathers belonged, manifests a new proof of its own intimate unity and of its own unconquerable vital force, and, complying with the demands of their own hearts, let them take care to extricate themselves from that state in which they cannot be secure about their own salvation.[2]

---

[2] The late Pope Pius XII used this very phrase in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi.* In that document he invited non-Catholics "to co-operate generously and willingly with the inward impulses of divine grace and to take care to extricate themselves from that condition in which they cannot be secure about their own eternal salvation." Cf. *AAS,* XXXV (1943), 243. For a discussion of this expression, see Fenton, *The Catholic Church and Salvation,* p. 85.

They should not cease to offer up most fervent prayers to the Lord of mercy that He may tear down the wall of division, dispel the mist of error, and bring them back to the embrace of holy mother Church, in which their forefathers possessed the salutary nourishment of life, and in which alone the integral doctrine of Christ Jesus is conserved and taught, and the mysteries of heavenly grace are dispensed.

But since We, by reason of the duty of Our supreme Apostolic ministry, imposed upon Us by Christ the Lord Himself, are obligated most carefully to perform all the functions of a good shepherd, and to have and hold fatherly charity towards all the men of the entire world, We are sending to all the Christians who are separated from Us this letter of Ours, in which We exhort and beseech them with all the force at Our command to make haste and return to the only sheepfold of Christ. Sincerely and with all Our soul We will their salvation in Jesus Christ, and We are fearful that one day We shall have to answer to Our Judge unless, to the best of Our ability, We point out and protect the way to attain that same eternal salvation.

Certainly We shall never cease, humbly and with fullness of heart, in all prayer and obsecration, with the giving of thanks, to implore for them, night and day, an abundance of heavenly lights and graces from the eternal Shepherd of souls.

And since, although through no merit of Our own, We serve as His Vicar here on earth, We most ardently await, with outstretched hands, the return of these errant children to the embrace of the Catholic Church, so that We may most affectionately receive them into the house of the heavenly Father and enrich them with its inexhaustible treasures. For the salvation, not only of individuals, but also of the entire Christian society, depends upon this most desired return to the truth and the communion with the Catholic Church. And the entire world can enjoy no true peace unless there be one fold and one shepherd.[3]

The *Iam vos omnes* centers around these points:

(1) The Holy Father informs those to whom he is writing about the purpose of the forthcoming council and the benefits to be expected from it.

(2) He considers it his duty, on the occasion of the calling of the council, to address himself to all non-Catholics who acknowledge Christ as Lord and Redeemer to take heed of their own position with respect to Christ and to their own salvation.

---

[3] *Acta et Decreta,* columns 8 ff.; Cecconi, *op. cit.,* I, 390-94.

(3) He points to the evidence that Our Lord founded His true Church on Peter, and that the sects, whether considered collectively or individually, cannot constitute this true Church.

(4) He adverts to the fact that even in the civil order the differences of sectarianism have a pernicious effect.

(5) He begs those to whom he is writing to profit from the demonstration of Catholic ecclesiastical unity inherent in the example of the council to extricate themselves from a situation in which they cannot be secure about their own salvation.

(5) He exhorts them to pray towards that end, and to enter the true Church, which is their real spiritual home.

(6) He states that it is his duty as Sovereign Pontiff thus to point out the way of salvation to them.

INVITATION TO THE COUNCIL

The most obvious difference between the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* and the *Iam vos omnes* is to be found in the fact that the former embodies an invitation to the men to whom it is addressed to enter into and to take part in the forthcoming Vatican Council, while the latter contains nothing of the sort. The dissident Eastern Bishops to whom the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* is sent are not only invited but exhorted and begged to come to this council, as their predecessors had made their way to the Second Ecumenical Council of Lyons and to the Ecumenical Council of Florence. On the other hand, the Protestants and the other non-Catholics who profess themselves believers in and followers of Our Lord are urged and entreated to profit from the occasion and the example of the forthcoming council to look to their religious position, to pray for guidance, and to enter the true and only Church of Christ. They are *not* invited to attend the council.

The reason for this difference is to be found in the very nature of the ecumenical council itself. The ecumenical council is an organ of the Church's jurisdictional activity, and consequently of its *magisterium,* not by reason of any merely ecclesiastical law, but rather because of the divine constitution of the Church.[4] The supernatural kingdom of God according to the dispensation of the New Testament has been established in such a way that jurisdiction over the universal Church can be exercised either by the prince of the apostolic college acting individually or by the entire apostolic college gathered together by Peter's authority, and working under his direction.[5] In order to have this jurisdiction or act of *magisterium* effective for the universal Church, the teachings or the decrees of the apostolic college must be confirmed by the head of that college and actually promulgated by him.

---

[4] Sylvius, in what is perhaps the most penetrating scholastic study of the councils in theological history, asserts emphatically that ecclesiastical councils, including ecumenical councils, "have an origin in the Church which is partly

Essentially, then, the ecumenical council is a gathering of the apostolic college, that is, of the Roman Pontiff and the other residential bishops of the one true Church of Jesus Christ. The divine constitution of the Church is such that the head of the apostolic college can bring into the council, with the right of deliberative vote, churchmen who are in positions of authority among the faithful, but who are not actually members of the apostolic college. Such was the procedure at the apostolic council of Jerusalem, where "the apostles and ancients assembled,"[6] and where the conciliar letter was sent by these same "apostles and ancients."[7] In our time the ecclesiastical law gives the right of deliberative vote in an ecumenical council to Cardinals who are not residential bishops, to abbots and prelates *nullius,* and decrees that titular bishops who are called to the council may have a deliberative vote unless it should be stipulated otherwise by the Roman Pontiff when they are summoned.[8]

In the light of this truth about the ecumenical council, the invitation extended to the bishops of the dissident Eastern Churches in the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* is clearly explained. The men to whom this invitation was extended were the validly consecrated heads of existent Christian communities which had once been contained within the true Church universal. They were the active leaders of Christian communities which were outside of the true Church primarily and almost entirely by reason of schism.

---

divine and partly apostolic, and which is not merely human." Cf. Sylvius, *Controversiae,* Lib. V, q. 1, art. 1; in the *Opera omnia,* edited by D'Elbeque and published at Antwerp in 1698, V, 343.

[5] Cf. Fenton, "The Study of the Ecumenical Council," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXL, 4 (April, 1959), 263 ff.

[6] Cf. *Acts,* 15:6.

[7] Cf. *Acts,* 15:23.

[8] Canon 223.

Thus it becomes clear that if these men had gone to the Vatican Council as their predecessors had gone to Second Lyons and to Florence, they could have become members of this council with the right of deliberative vote. The predecessors of the men to whom the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* was addressed had gone to these ecumenical councils and had there professed their acceptance of the Roman Pontiff's primacy within the one true Church and of the faith of the Roman Church. They made such professions in their own names, and in the names of the congregations over which they presided. Once these professions had been made and accepted, these men had status as residential bishops within the one Church militant of the New Testament. They belonged to that group which is in an ecumenical council, not merely by reason of ecclesiastical law or concession, but by the very nature of the council.

On the other hand, the situation of the Protestant and other non-Catholic Christian leaders is quite different. Pope Pius IX hoped and prayed for their return to the one true Church just as truly and as sincerely as he did for the return of the dissident Oriental Bishops and the flocks over which they exercised their vigilance. There was, however, no question at all of inviting these men to take part in any ecumenical council.

If any of the men to whom the *Iam vos omnes* was addressed had actually profited from that letter, and had finally entered the ranks of the true Church, his position would have been that of an ordinary Catholic layman. The religious assemblies to which such men belonged and over which they presided were not Christian Churches which had separated from the unity of the Catholic Church by any process of schism. They were essentially heretical assemblies. And there was no mere process of reconciliation by which such gatherings could be restored to any status which would give to its leader the privilege or the right to take part in an ecumenical council of the Catholic Church.

This remains true even of non-Catholic Christian groups which are headed by men in valid episcopal orders, as we can see from what the Directing Congregation for the Vatican Council decided in the case of the Jansenistic assemblies centering around Utrecht in Holland. The Congregation decided against inviting the bishops of this sect to the council, even on condition that they make the requisite acts of faith and of submission. It also refused to issue to them any special invitation to repentance and conversion. It judged that these people should be simply considered as among those to whom the *Iam vos omnes* was to be sent.[9]

The texts of the *Arcano divinae Providentiae* and the *Iam vos omnes* bring out with matchless clarity the desire of the Roman Pontiffs for the conversion of all dissident Christians to the true Church of Jesus Christ. They show that the Sovereign Pontiff's office as the successor to St. Peter in the post of authority over the entire Church of Christ carries with a serious and pressing obligation to pray and work for the salvation of all those for whom Our Lord shed His blood on Calvary. And they bring out the fact that the Popes are especially obligated to strive for the salvation of those who are joined to Christ by their acceptance of Him as Lord and as Saviour. Pope Pius IX took the occasion of the convocation of an ecumenical council, as he would have taken any other occasion which he deemed opportune and efficacious, to attempt to advance the cause he loved so dearly.

We may be sure that the present gloriously reigning Supreme Pontiff, Pope John XXIII, will likewise pray and work as effectively as he can for the salvation of non-Catholic Christians on the occasion of the forthcoming ecumenical council. He may not take exactly the same steps as those taken by his great predecessor of ninety years ago, but he will be working for exactly the same objective, and with exactly the same divinely constituted means at his disposal. The council towards which a Preparatory Commission is already working will be for Pope John XXIII, as the Vatican Council was for Pope Pius IX, an occasion for bringing dissident Christians into the embrace of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

But the council, precisely as an ecumenical council, must remain exactly as it is constituted by and in the divine constitution of the Catholic Church. Centrally and essentially it must remain an assembly of the apostolic college within the Catholic Church. Those who are summoned to it by divine right in the Church are the residential bishops of that Church, the successors of the apostles and the members of the Church's apostolic college. Those who are called to it to have a deliberative vote in its sessions must be other men of authority within the one and only supernatural kingdom of God on earth.

---

[9] Cf. *Acta et Decreta,* columns 1060 f.

It would, of course, be perfectly possible for a Sovereign Pontiff to invite non-Catholic Christian religious leaders to a conference with Catholic prelates. Such a conference, with a membership including individuals who do not profess the true faith and who do not accept the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction, would definitely not be an ecumenical council.

The ecumenical council can only be effective for the work of Christian reunion when it operates precisely in line with its own nature within the fabric of the divine constitution of the Catholic Church. It can serve to influence dissidents to come back to the unity of the Church only when it acts as the assembly of the apostles and the elders of God's true Church, laboring, as the Vatican Council proclaimed that it would work, "for the praise and the glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, for the increase and the exaltation of the Catholic faith and religion, for the extirpation of flourishing errors, for the reformation of the Christian clergy and people, and for the common peace and concord of all."[10]

It has occasionally been suggested by some writers that non-Catholics might well be invited to attend the forthcoming ecumenical council as observers. It would certainly be within the field of competence of the papal power to issue such an invitation, but this procedure for the forthcoming council appears unlikely.

An observer at one of the public sessions of the ecumenical council would simply be in the position of hearing the reading of a Latin document which would be publicized throughout the entire world within seconds after its promulgation by the Holy Father as an official act of the council. And, at the Vatican Council, conciliar gatherings other than the public sessions were covered by a law of strict secrecy.[11] If this same rule should be imposed on the forthcoming ecumenical council, it might be somewhat cumbersome to have non-Catholic observers invited to attend meetings of congregations and *deputationes* whose own members would be forbidden to reveal discussions that take place within them.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, column 32. It was with this formula that the Vatican Council began its labors in its first session. The Apostolic Letter *Aeterni Patris Unigenitus* in which Pope Pius IX formally convoked the Vatican Council also spoke of the destruction of *"grassantes errores"* as an integral part of the purpose of the ecumenical council. Cf. *ibid.*, col. 2.

[11] This obligation of secrecy was imposed in section III of the Apostolic Letter *Multiplices inter,* issued Nov. 27, 1869, the document setting forth the rules for the forthcoming Vatican Council. Cf. *Acta et Decreta,* col. 19.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE CONFESSOR SUGGESTING RHYTHM

Question: May a confessor suggest to married persons the use of Rhythm in the following cases: (1) There is a good reason for avoiding children, at least for the present, but the couple have been practicing contraception. (2) There is no reason for avoiding children, but the couple have been practicing contraception. (3) There is a good reason for avoiding children, but the couple have been practicing complete abstinence, apparently believing that this is the only method they may lawfully employ?

Answer: (1) In this case the confessor may certainly suggest the use of Rhythm, if he has reason to hope that it will be accepted in place of the sin of contraception. For in the circumstances described the use of Rhythm would be sinless.

(2) Even in this case, the confessor may suggest Rhythm, if he has hopes that he will thus persuade the couple to give up contraception. This was the substance of a decision given by the Sacred Penitentiary in 1880. The question proposed to this Tribunal was: "Whether the confessor may suggest such a procedure (periodic continence) either to the wife who detests the onanism of her husband but cannot correct him, or to either spouse who shrinks from having numerous offspring?" The reply of the Penitentiary was: "The confessor may suggest the opinion in question, cautiously however, to those married persons whom he has tried in vain by other means to dissuade from the detestable crime of onanism" (*Analecta Juris Pontificii,* series 22 [1883], p. 249). The admonition that this must be done cautiously indicates that the confessor must avoid the danger of scandal, which was more likely to happen eighty years ago than nowadays. There was no indication in the question or the response that the reference was only to those who had a good reason for the practice of periodic continence, from which it would seem to follow that even those who have no reason for avoiding children can be given the advice to practice Rhythm, on the principle that a person can be urged to practice the lesser of two evils if this is the only way in which he can be dissuaded from a greater evil. For all would admit that the practice of Rhythm

without a justifying reason, at least for a few (perhaps even four or five) years, is a venial sin, and if a couple can be induced to substitute this for contraception, it can be hoped that within the course of the years they may be induced to use their marriage rights without regard to the time of the month.

(3) Certainly, a priest may explain to a married couple who are practicing complete abstinence, because they (lawfully) wish to avoid children and apparently believe that total abstinence is the only legitimate course, that they are permitted to practice Rhythm. For the practice of total abstinence would normally arouse a strain and tension that might be harmful, psychologically and spiritually, to the peace and joy of domestic life.

It should be emphasized, however, that the confessor should never give any absolute assurance that the Rhythm will infallibly prevent conception. Moreover, as far as the psychological element of this practice is concerned, he should recommend that the advice of a good doctor be sought and not attempt to explain this procedure himself.

A CHAPLAIN'S POWER TO CONFIRM

Question: If a hospital or orphanage chaplain has been authorized to confirm children, may he use this delegation to confirm a mentally retarded person who is an adult in years but never attained the use of reason?

Answer: The questioner is referring to a rescript of the Congregation of the Sacraments, first granted on November 18, 1948, and regularly renewed since that time, delegating regular chaplains (the first chaplain only, if there are several) in maternity hospitals and orphanages the power to confirm validly and licitly children who are received there and are in danger of death, if a bishop or the local pastor cannot be procured. (Cfr. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* Vol. iv, p. 253.)

Although the permission seems to have been granted for the benefit of newly born infants (in the case of maternity hospital chaplains) and of children (in the case of chaplains of orphan asylums), it would seem that it can be reasonably used for the benefit of a person who is mentally deficient, though an adult in age, if such a person happens to be confined in one of these institutions. For such a person, in a theological sense, can be called a child.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF A VASECTOMIZED MAN

Question: May a man use his marriage rights if he has had the operation of double vasectomy merely in order to avoid conception? And, if so, must he have an operation in order to have the tubes put together again?

Answer: According to a solidly probable opinion a married man who has had the operation of double vasectomy is allowed to exercise his conjugal rights. For, very probably he has been rendered merely sterile, not impotent, by this operation. The obligation of having another operation in order to rectify the harm that has been done depends on the probability of success. If there is very little hope of rectification (as usually seems to be the case) there is no such obligation. If there is good hope that a surgeon will succeed, it seems that the man has the duty of allowing him to make the attempt, since an operation of this kind involves very little inconvenience or danger. Recently I heard of a certain doctor who claims to have achieved success in about 50% of the cases submitted to him. I believe that if a vasectomized man could get to such a doctor without much inconvenience, he would be bound to have the operation rectified, provided he intended to continue conjugal relations. But, despite such a claim, I doubt that anything approaching this degree of success can be attained, at least by the ordinary surgeon.

THE PRIEST AS A HYPNOTIST

Question: May a priest use hypnotism as an aid to his pastoral work? The presumption is that he first obtains the consent of the person he is trying to aid. The purpose is to help the person to relax and to be better prepared to receive the priest's admonitions and advice.

Answer: In itself, the use of hypnotism by a priest would not be forbidden, provided there is some good result to be hoped for, the priest obtains the person's consent, and is capable of performing the functions of a hypnotist efficiently. In practice, however, I would recommend that a priest abstain from such a procedure, especially if he attempts to hypnotize the same person frequently. For, the practice of hypnotizing the same subject frequently is likely to be detrimental to the patient. Moreover, such a practice by a priest is likely to give scandal, when it becomes publicly known. The traditional method of the use of kindness and charity, joined with prayer for God's help in his ministerial activity, is the best method for the priest to employ.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

ADORATION AT THE REPOSITORY

Question: How long is the adoration at the Repository to be continued? Until the liturgical service of Good Friday?

Answer: The text of the OHS directs that the adoration, begun at the end of Thursday's Mass, be continued at least until midnight "when the commemoration of the institution of the most holy Eucharist gives way to the memory of the Lord's passion and death." Bugnini feels that the adoration should cease at midnight but he would allow for a gradual transition from the longer period previously observed. He says: "In order not to have too harsh a break from the tradition of a long period of adoration at the so-called 'sepulchre,' the adoration may be continued until the 'liturgical action' of the following day. In our opinion and, if we do not mistake, in accordance with the ***spirit*** of the restored rite, the adoration should cease at midnight of Thursday. For Friday, the day dedicated to the passion and death of our Lord, begins at that time. Therefore at the altar of reposition all the lights except one should be extinguished and the holy Eucharist should be reserved in the repository as it is ordinarily in the tabernacle. In order gradually to achieve this end the faithful must be given solid and consistent instruction; meanwhile it suffices to remove the elements that are entirely out of keeping and to make of the altar of reposition a magnificent Eucharistic altar" (*Eph. Lit.* LXX [1956], p. 157; cf. also p. 142).

CORPUS CHRISTI AND THE ADDITION OF ALLELUIA

Question: Since the Corpus Christi feast has no longer an octave, is it still official and obligatory to add the *"alleluia"* after the *"Panem de coelo"* at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament till the feast of the Sacred Heart?

Answer: The Ordo of the Universal Church, published by D'Auria of Naples, directs us to add the *"alleluia"* from the First Vespers of Corpus Christi through the feast itself and on the following Sunday, when the solemnity is regularly observed.

POSITION OF THE MONSTRANCE

Question: What part of the monstrance, before and after Benediction, should face the congregation: a) the front, b) the back, c) one of the sides? I have seen all three positions.

Answer: Although I find no legislation on the point, rubricians generally direct that the monstrance be set on the mensa with the front facing toward the Gospel side, thus presenting the side to the congregation.

SIGN OF THE CROSS ON THE GOSPEL

Question: When the Gospel is read or sung at Mass, is the sign of the cross made on the cross printed in the missal before the word *Initium* or *Sequentia,* or on the word *In* in *In illo tempore,* or is it made on the very first word of the actual Gospel text? Does the kiss follow the same rule?

Answer: The *Ritus* (VI, 2) says that the sign is to be made *"super principio Evangelii"*; the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* (II, viii, 46) reads: *"Diaconus . . . signat librum, ubi est textus Evangelii."* It would seem, therefore, that the mark should be made on the first word of the actual Gospel text, which will generally be the first word after *In illo tempore.* The cross printed in the missal is meant to indicate the *time* when the sign is to be made, i.e., as the priest utters *Initium* or *Sequentia.* The kiss would be governed by the same considerations; the celebrant would kiss the first word of the actual Gospel text.

BURSE AGAINST THE TABERNACLE

Question: Is it wrong to rest the burse against the tabernacle?

Answer: In several decrees (2067, X; 2906; 4000, I) the S.R.C. has prohibited placing objects of various kinds *in front of the door* of the tabernacle. In S.R.C. 4165, II the Congregation makes an exception for altar cards, which may be rested against the tabernacle door in the manner prescribed by custom. In the light of these decrees it would seem that we should avoid resting the burse against the *door* of the tabernacle. However, I see no impropriety in resting the right edge of the burse against the left edge of the tabernacle when there is no other support available. Regularly, of course, the burse should rest against the gradine; if the gradine is too shallow to offer support, the burse may be rested against a candlestick or vase.

BOOK ON VESTMENTS

Question: Kindly give me the title, author, and publisher of a good text on Mass vestments: material to be used, style, ornamentation, etc.

Answer: I would recommend Dom E. A. Roulin's book, *Vestments and Vesture,* which was published in English translation in 1931 by B. Herder Book Co. The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, reissued the work in 1950.

PRIVILEGED REQUIEM MASSES

Question: Is the time for the Masses on the third, seventh, and thirtieth days computed from the day of death or from any day between death and burial? Do these Masses have to be sung or may they also be read?

Answer: Father J. B. O'Connell (in *The Celebration of Mass,* pp. 153 ff.) says: "The days may be calculated either from the day of death or burial, and, by recognized usage, in making the calculation the day itself (of death or burial) may be included or excluded. Hence, *e.g.,* if a person died on March 6 and was buried on March 8, the privileged seventh day would be either the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth of March." You are reminded that only *one* Mass, sung or low, is privileged in each church.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

Book Reviews

A POET BEFORE THE CROSS. By Paul Claudel. Translated by Wallace Fowlie. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1958. Pp. 269. $6.50.

This work of Claudel is a series of spiritual reflections on scriptural themes: a consideration of the meaning of the Cross, thoughts on the Seven Last Words, and the Prayers of Holy Week. First published in 1938, it has been brought out for the first time in English in this edition.

It is a book well worth the effort of translating, since it is Claudel at his religious best. It was begun in America in 1933 and finished in 1935 in Brussels. Claudel had just completed his years of service as French Ambassador in Washington; his early references in the work mention frequently the New World in which he found himself. He was writing when he was about sixty-five years old, so that the volume may justly be called the spiritual reflections of a man in his later years—even though Claudel was to live on for another twenty years.

The purpose of the author in writing must be appreciated; if it is not, the book might easily be misunderstood. What Claudel has done here is to open up his soul for the sake of his readers; there is perhaps more of Claudel in the chapters than there is of Scripture. The Bible was for him a source of pious meditation, a means of contacting God; what he has written down are the thoughts that this experience with the Word of God has brought forth.

In this day when Scripture is constantly subjected to critical analysis, and the human authors and the characters of the narrative are psychoanalyzed over the vista of two thousand years, it is consoling to see that for some it is still a source of personal devotion. Claudel is not speaking as an exegete; he is not concerned with the literal sense, nor the mind of Luke, nor the understanding of the primitive community. He is concerned with Claudel's sense, and he is exactly what he says in the title: A Poet Before the Cross.

As a result, these are very personal reflections, but they reveal to us the spirituality of a man who writes as a poet because he thinks as a poet. There is a long-standing tradition of this approach to Scripture, and it is good to see it in the writing of a modern man. The Bible, after all, is intended to be more than a source book for scientific dictionaries; it is the Word of God. Only the magisterium may interpret the texts authentically, but within the realm of orthodoxy, she has never forbidden the faithful to meditate upon these sacred words according to their own needs. In fact, in her liturgy, the Church has done the very same thing in adapting texts to express things not directly included in the literal sense itself.

The style of Claudel, even in translation, is true poetry even though he is writing prose; this enhances the beauty of the book. What will strike the Catholic reader, however, is the profound conviction and faith of this celebrated layman who found again at the age of eighteen the Church of his childhood. He grew in that faith during the years that followed, and the reader who will look between the lines can perceive how much that faith meant to him and how intimately it was joined to his daily life.

JOHN L. MURPHY

FREUD AND RELIGION. By Gregory Zilboorg, M.D., F.A.P.A. Woodstock Papers No. 3. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1958. Pp. 65. 95¢.

The question of Freud and religion has given rise to lively expressions of opinion in recent years. And one might suspect that Freud is being kept alive mainly by those most anxious to see him dead. Nevertheless, the publication of this monograph on "Freud and Religion" is both timely and justified, for it is occasioned by the completion of Ernest Jones' biography of Freud. Jones' three volume work brings into relief the old problem, and since the biography is considered significant and monumental, a restatement of the old controversy is called for. This Dr. Zilboorg has done for us, and the particular merit of the third Woodstock Paper is that its author has drawn entirely from Jones' own citations selected from Freud. In this way Zilboorg has cleared himself of a possible accusation of bias. The paper then becomes an *exposé* of Freud in the words of his biographer and long-time friend. One can see Jones an unhappy biographer, on account of the words that now fall from his lips.

On the basis of these texts, Zilboorg proceeds to analyze Freud's religious situation and finds it to be a "deeply emotional preoccupation." Religion was a personal problem with Freud, and the apparent conflict between psychoanalysis and religion does not, therefore, stem from psychoanalysis itself. "Freud both pursued and was pursued by religious problems" (p. 29). To the very end of his life Freud grappled with his problem, and though he claimed to have discarded religion, actually he was never free of it. Zilboorg shows how Freud "protests too much," and this he diagnoses as evident defensiveness. "To the psychologically initiated such a drive to defend one's own position is more a sign of insecurity than serene conviction. Only the man who is anxious and insecure finds it necessary to assure himself and others time and again of the validity of his position" (p. 28).

Despite his efforts, Freud never succeeded in resolving his religious difficulties, and his very concept of religion was a distortion from the beginning. "The religion Freud had in mind was not really a religion but the somewhat sentimental, somewhat anxious attitude toward God on the part of the man in the street. It is the anxious, cowering belief of the little man, who feels the burden of what Freud calls 'the forcible imposition of mental infantilism'" (p. 31).

Freud imagined that religion was opposed to science, and this notion was common among scientists of the period. He considered psychology to be the only valid science, and went about his research with a passion for objectivity that turns out to be what Zilboorg calls a "refined subjectivity."

Much has been said concerning Freud's "passion for science," his "devotion to suffering humanity," and his "sincere atheism." Whatever may have been Freud's genius and his contribution toward a deeper understanding of human problems, later developments indicate a need for rather crucial adjustments. In his own lifetime these began to appear among his intimate associates and have continued to the present. The concern of modern psychotherapy for religion in its significance for the patient is evidence of a vigorous and healthy development in psychiatry. Religion has too long been judged a neurosis, and it is encouraging to see an increasing number of analysts concerning themselves, no longer now with the "future of an illusion," but with the "eternity of a reality."

Freud rejected a number of the arguments for religion as inadequate, and Catholic theologians would likewise have to reject religion if the arguments as Freud presented them were the true ones. His misconceptions concerning religion were passed on with whatever else might be considered good in his doctrine. For example, he mistakenly considered selective, isolated elements of religion to be the totality of religious synthesis; he devised facile generalities based on the religious abnormalities of his patients; he abstracted a concept of religion inspired by anthropological theory that was proven false even in his own day; and most remarkable of all, he failed to distinguish pathological religious symbolism, as the possible vehicle of neurosis, from true religion. In the words of Dr. Zilboorg, Freud confused "faith with superstition, ritual with magic, theology with illusion" (p. 13).

"Psychoanalysis," Freud tells us, "has made us aware of the intimate connection between the father complex and belief in God, and has taught us that the personal God is *psychologically* nothing other than a magnified father" (p. 30). All beliefs for Freud are mere psychological constructs, illusions, which are characterized by the prominence of wish-fulfillment as a motivational factor.

For one who claimed to have demolished religion, Freud never ceased writing about it. *The Future of an Illusion* proposed the hypothesis that religion is an illusion and science the only hope of doing away with it. *Moses and Monotheism* describes religion as nothing but psychological processes projected into the outer world. *Group Psychology* speaks of religion as universal compulsive neurosis. And *Totem and Taboo,* on the origin of religion, makes God an introjected father figure. In view of these notions, Zilboorg concludes: "Despite his incisiveness, Freud remained unclear as to what real religion is" (p. 32).

Freud made no positive contribution to the psychology of religion, and he was, in fact, incompetent to do so, because of his own religious conflict. The religious elements, therefore, must be abstracted from Freud's psychoanalysis, since they are personal, and not a *conditio sine qua non* of psychoanalysis itself. Indeed, Jung's attitude of utilitarian, pragmatic exploitation, in the service of psychotherapy, is more dangerous (p. 5). But it is unfortunate that Freud used psychoanalysis to justify his atheism, and Zilboorg notes that it is possible to be a Catholic and a psychoanalyst at the same time.

Further evidence is offered in support of the thesis that there is no conflict. Pius XII's address (Easter, 1949) to a group of students on pilgrimage from the University of Paris contains the following statement: "In your studies and scientific research rest assured that no contradiction is possible between the certain truths of faith and established scientific facts. Nature, no less than revelation, proceeds from God, and God cannot contradict Himself" (p. 24).

Zilboorg could have gone further, but perhaps not in a monograph of this small size. The issue here is something more than Freud or psychoanalysis. St. Thomas dealt with it under the form of "faith and reason," and philosophers encountered it again in the rise of positivism. Empirical psychology from the beginning had a significance for theology and philosophy because of its implications concerning the concept of soul. The psychology of the unconscious gave rise to problems involving the Wundtian psycho-physical techniques and assumptions. Within his own lifetime Freud's disciples advanced opposing doctrines, and so also have the neo-psychoanalysts and the ego-psychologists of this day. And looking forward into the future, one wonders what will be the effect of the existentialist and personalist impacts on psychotherapy.

There are conflicts within conflicts, and Freud grows less significant with every new advance. There are those who claim that Freudianism has been dead in Europe for some thirty years; yet it lives on in the United States. And a rather recent issue of *Time* magazine, in a feature article on Freud, offered the explanation that all old theories, when they die, come to the United States.

The statement of Pius XII has been repeated and verified in so many of his addresses to a wide variety of scientific groups. Dr. Zilboorg, in a large work, would perhaps go back to a *motu proprio* of Pius XI, *In multis solaciis* (1937), instituting the new Pontifical Academy of Sciences, where it is written: "Science, which is the true knowledge of things, never conflicts with the truths of Christian faith; indeed, as those who examine the annals of the sciences must admit, there has never been a time when the Roman Pontiffs, in union with the Church, failed to encourage the investigations of the learned, even in those matters which are known by experimental researches." Going back even further, to August 4, 1879, the same year that Wundt founded the first formal psychological laboratory, Pope Leo XIII issued the encyclical *Aeterni patris,* ordering the revival of the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas as the remedy for the confusion and sterility of the philosophy of that period. Leo XIII directed attention to the progress that had been made in the natural sciences and exhorted Catholic philosophers and theologians to take note of this progress, to advance with it and not against it.

These further observations from the popes are offered to give additional support to the thesis that there really is no conflict between religion and any of the sciences. Yet we need not try to effect a "synthesis" in the sense of an amalgamation of the two types of discipline, except insofar as there may be unity in the thinking of the individual person who happens to be Catholic as well as psychoanalyst. This point, in a larger work, might undergo further clarification.

In judging the merits of this little work, one must consider not only its content but its presentation as well. Dr. Zilboorg undoubtedly wanted to do an effective paper that could be easily read by a wide circle of readers. This he has done, for the reader can go through the booklet in a short time and put it aside with definite convictions and a comfortable feeling that now the thing is quite settled. As always, Dr. Zilboorg writes a lively style with evident self-assurance, and it is clear that now the last word has indeed been spoken.

RAMON A. DI NARDO

THE CHURCH INCARNATE: THE SACRED FUNCTION OF CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE. By Rudolph Schwarz. Translated by Cynthia Harris. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1958. Pp. 231. $7.50.

Mies van der Rohe, in his foreword, recommends this book to "anyone sincerely interested in architecture." It is especially important for the architect, the parish priest and anyone else concerned with building churches. It is important because it considers a church as the living expression of eternal verities. (The three important words are: living, eternal, verities.) It speaks of the basic symbolism of church shapes.

And this is important because architects and their patrons today consider building as a problem of copying traditional shapes, or derivitism, or as an opportunity for experimenting with new and daring architectural feats, or, at best, as a problem of serving a particular material function. Architects are engineers and patrons demand only copies. Neither looks to the whole and its need and right to be a concrete expression of the true and living meaning of the Divine-human and the human-Divine relationship at the moment of public worship.

Schwarz divides his book into four sections. In the fourth and last section he explains his purpose and attempts to justify his work. His book "is intended to be a primer for church building—no more but also no less . . . A good book for doing must not work out the final solution . . . there are no such things as solutions above and beyond history." In the first and introductory section he lays his foundation, he attempts to set the mind of the reader to thinking of the total problem. We need to take the human body seriously again, as mediaeval man did. "Sacred structure is no longer understood as that which it actually is . . . We cannot return to the early cathedrals . . . The great realities of the cathedral are no longer real to us . . . On the other hand it does not suffice to work honestly with the means and forms of our own time. It is only out of sacred reality that sacred building can grow. What begets sacred works is not the life of the world but the life of faith—the faith, however, of our own time."

At the end of the first section, Schwarz says: "We have not wished to set forth a theory and we shall not now proceed to a practical application." What he does is present seven "plans," or seven conceptions of the church building, or seven general expressions of a true symbolism. This requires the bulk of the book, the second and third sections. The "plans" are given names like "the open ring," "the chalice of light," "the way." In his conclusion the author states that "With the 'plans' we introduce something new into the doctrines of architecture"; they are not "model designs" nor "specifications" nor "parts of an architectural 'canon'" nor "formulas." But they are very important first considerations for any man who would start to build a church today.

The principal criticism of this book is that it is completely veiled in what this reviewer would call Teutonic mysticism. The author would undoubtedly argue that the mystical presentation is indispensable to any true exposition of reality. But the reader will wish with every page that the introduction and the "plans" could be presented more simply and with greater clarity. The translator, apparently realizing this difficulty, writes a "Translator's Invitation" recommending the quiet, meditative approach to the book.

One wishes that the discussions of the symbolism of the whole church, shorn of its mystical trappings, might be extended more to its parts, say doors and windows. The Schoolman will be confused by the frequent and unaccustomed use of the word "form."

Thomas Phelan

Books Received

Four Marian Encyclicals and the Apostolic Constitution Munificentissimus Deus of Pope Pius XII. With Discussion Club Outlines by Reverend Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. Introduction by Reverend William F. Hogan, S.T.D. Edited by Reverend Edward R. Lawler, C.S.P. New York: Paulist Press, 1959. Pp. 158. $1.50.

La teoría del Regio Vicariato Español en Indias. By Antonio de Egaña, S.J. In the collection *Analecta Gregoriana*, Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae, XCV, Sectio B, n. 17. Rome: The Gregorian University, 1958. Pp. xxi + 315. $5.00.

Hacia la Primera Teologia de la Procesion del Verbo. By Antonio Orbe, S.J. In the collection *Analecta Gregoriana*, Series Facultatis Theologicae, XCIX and C, Sectio A, n. 17. Rome: The Gregorian University, 1958. Pp. xx + 512 and viii + 309. Two volumes, $10.00.

Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army. By Leo F. Solt. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1959. Pp. 150. $4.00.

The Virgin of Port Lligat. By Fray Angelico Chavez. Fresno, Cal.: Academy Library Guild, 1959. Pp. xvii + 71. $3.25.

Social Principles and Economic Life. By Rev. John F. Cronin, S.S., Ph.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. xxiii + 436. $6.50.

Life of Union with Mary. By Emil Neubert, S.M., S.T.D. Translated from the French by Sylvester P. Juergens, S.M., S.T.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. xii + 255. $4.95.

The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers. Volume Three. From Pentecost to the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost. Translated and Edited by M. F. Toal, D.D. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1959. Pp. xi + 379. This book comes in two formats. There is a library size volume which sells for $7.50, and a pocket size which sells for $4.50.

IN THE WHOLE CHRIST. PRAYERFUL MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH. By Most Rev. Emile Guerry, Archbishop of Cambrai. Translated from the French by M. G. Carroll. New York: Society of St. Paul, 1959. Pp. 351. $3.50.

A HISTORY OF MODERN GERMANY: THE REFORMATION. By Hajo Holborn. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. Pp. xvi + 374 + xxi. $8.75.

ANTONIO ROSMINI NEL PRIMO CENTENARIO DELLA MORTE. Edited by Clemente Riva. Florence, Italy: G. C. Sansoni, 1959. Pp. viii + 274. No price given.

HOW TO GIVE A RETREAT. PRACTICAL NOTES. By Ignatius Iparraguirre, S.J. Bombay, India: St. Xavier's High School, 1959. Pp. 188. No price given.

THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE PRAELECTIONES QUAS IN SCHOLIS FACULTATIS THEOLOGICAE SYDNEYENSIS HABEBAT THOMAS MULDOON, S.T.D. Volumen III. De Deo Creante et Elevante. Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1959. Pp. xvi + 418. No price given.

THE FATHERS OF THE GREEK CHURCH. By Hans von Campenhausen. Translated by Stanley Godman. New York: Pantheon, 1959. Pp. 170. $3.95.

HAPPINESS WITH GOD. By Dom Basil Whelan, O.S.B. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1959. Pp. 149. $2.75.